

CASSANDRA IN AESYCHYLUS' 'AGAMEMNON' :
LANGUAGE AND CHARACTER INTERACTION

Athanasios Varvatsoulis

A Thesis Submitted for the Degree of MPhil
at the
University of St Andrews



1993

Full metadata for this item is available in
St Andrews Research Repository
at:

<http://research-repository.st-andrews.ac.uk/>

Please use this identifier to cite or link to this item:

<http://hdl.handle.net/10023/15443>

This item is protected by original copyright

CASSANDRA IN AESCHYLUS' AGAMEMNON

LANGUAGE AND CHARACTER INTERACTION

ATHANASIOS VARVATSOULIS

M.PHIL (MODE A)

DATE OF SUBMISSION: 16.12.92



ProQuest Number: 10170734

All rights reserved

INFORMATION TO ALL USERS

The quality of this reproduction is dependent upon the quality of the copy submitted.

In the unlikely event that the author did not send a complete manuscript and there are missing pages, these will be noted. Also, if material had to be removed, a note will indicate the deletion.



ProQuest 10170734

Published by ProQuest LLC (2017). Copyright of the Dissertation is held by the Author.

All rights reserved.

This work is protected against unauthorized copying under Title 17, United States Code
Microform Edition © ProQuest LLC.

ProQuest LLC.
789 East Eisenhower Parkway
P.O. Box 1346
Ann Arbor, MI 48106 – 1346

Th B302

TABLE OF CONTENTS

TABLE OF CONTENTS pp. 2-3

ABSTRACT AND DECLARATIONS pp. 4-5

INTRODUCTION pp. 6-9

PART I pp. 10-60

CHAPTER 1 A SURVEY OF CASSANDRA'S LANGUAGE pp. 10-48

A WORDS SUGGESTING DIVINE MADNESS pp.10- 25

- (i) *ENΘEOΣ pp. 11-12
- (ii) ΣΤΡΟΒΩ pp. 12- 13
- (iii) ΤΑΡΑΣΣΩΝ pp. 13-14
- (iv) ΜΑΙΝΟΜΑΙ pp. 14-17
- (v) ΘΕΟΦΟΡΗΤΟΣ pp. 17-24
- (vi) ΦΡΕΝΟΜΑΝΗΣ pp. 24
- (vii) ΘΕΡΜΟΝΟΥΣ pp. 25

B EXCLAMATIONS pp. 25-39

- (i) ᾠΑ pp. 25-26
- (ii) ΔΑ pp. 26-27
- (iii) ἰΟΥ p. 27
- (iv) ΠΑΠΑΙ pp. 27-28
- (v) ΠΟΠΟΙ pp. 28-29
- (vi) ΤΟΤΟΙ p. 30
- (vii) ἑ ᾠΕ pp. 30-32
- (viii) ἰΩ pp. 33-36
- (ix) ΦΕΥ pp. 36-39

C IMAGERY pp.39-43

D RECURRENT MOTIFS pp. 43-44

E VERBS AND SUBORDINATE CLAUSES pp. 44-45

F DIRECT QUESTIONS pp. 46-48

PART I CHAPTER 2 THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN CASSANDRA
AND APOLLO pp. 48-60

PART II CASSANDRA THE BARBARIAN pp. 61-95

INTRODUCTION pp. 61-62

1 GREEKS V BARBARIANS UNTIL THE TIME OF AESCHYLUS pp.
62-65

2 APOLLO AND ORIENTAL/ PRIMITIVE THOUGHT pp. 66-75

3 AESCHYLUS AND SOME TRADITIONAL MOTIFS pp. 75-79

4 ORIENTAL AND/OR PRIMITIVE ELEMENTS IN THE CASSANDRA
SCENE pp. 80-88

A APPEARANCE pp. 80-82

B FORM AND MEANING pp. 82-88

5 ORIENTAL/PRIMITIVE ELEMENTS OF THE RELATION
CASSANDRA-APOLLO pp. 89-95

PART III . AGAMEMNON AND CASSANDRA pp.96-117

PART IV . CLYTAEMNESTRA AND CASSANDRA pp.118-162

CONCLUSION pp. 163-165

BIBLIOGRAPHY (1) PRIMARY SOURCES pp.166-167

BIBLIOGRAPHY (2) SECONDARY SOURCES pp.167-182

INDEX OF PASSAGES CITED pp. 182- 189

ABSTRACT

This study in four parts examines the Cassandra scene in Aeschylus' Agamemnon, the first play in his sole extant trilogy entitled Oresteia. In the first part, a brief survey of Cassandra's language is given in which I try to argue that her deranged state affects her utterances and causes communication problems between her and the Chorus. The first part ends with a preliminary appraisal of her relationship with Apollo.

The second part deals with her barbarian aspect. At the beginning, I deal with the general antithesis between Greeks and Orientals and incorporate some information on the oriental and/or primitive elements of Apolline worship. The rest is more focused on Agamemnon and specifically on the debt of Aeschylus to the tradition; and on the oriental and/or primitive elements of Cassandra, without forgetting the King, the Queen and Apollo, whose figure and relationships with his "servants" are briefly discussed.

The third part examines the relationship between Agamemnon and Cassandra. Adopting a scene by scene analysis on the meaning of the presence (and sometimes absence) of the King, we come to the conclusion that the King, already overburdened with mistakes, commits another by having, unlike Apollo, a rather carnal relationship with Cassandra.

As for the last part, following the same principle of analysis, we deal with the majestic figure of the Queen. Through her manipulation of language, and consequently of the other personages (namely the Elders and Agamemnon), we try to

discover differences and possible similarities with Cassandra, on the basis of Clytaemnestra's and Cassandra's marginal status.

DECLARATIONS

(i) I, Athanasios Varvatsoulis, hereby certify that this thesis, which is approximately 60,000 words in length, has been written by me, that it is the record of the work carried out by me and that it has not been submitted in any previous application for a higher degree.

Date: 16/12/92 Signature of candidate.

(ii) I was admitted as a research student under ordinance No.12 in October 1991 and as a candidate for the degree of M.Phil (Mode A) in April 1992; the higher study for which this is a record was carried out in the University of St. Andrews between 1991 and 1992

Date: 16/12/92 Signature of the candidate.

(iii) I hereby certify that the candidate has fulfilled the conditions of the Resolution and the Regulations appropriate for the degree of M. Phil (Mode A) in the University of St. Andrews and that the candidate is qualified to submit this thesis in application for that degree.

Date: 17/12/92 Signature of supervisor.

(iv) In submitting this thesis to the University of St. Andrews I understand that I am giving permission for it to be made available for use in accordance with the regulations of the University Library for the time being in force, subject to any copyright vested in the work not being affected thereby. I also understand that the title and abstract will be published, and that a copy of the work may be made and supplied to any bona fide library or research worker.

INTRODUCTION

One of the reasons for the persistent popularity of the Oresteia is, I believe, Aeschylus' capacity to surprise continuously the audience. This stems in part from the attention the dramatist paid to dramatic conflicts, which permeate the whole trilogy (on these see Goldhill 1992, 35, 36). The almost complete reversal of every possible relation among gods, men, women and nature characterising Agamemnon (and to a lesser extent Choephoroi and Eumenides) is a powerful means of demonstrating that the world of the first part of the trilogy is considerably disturbed. Every sense of natural limit had been surpassed and one would not be far away from the reality if one said that Agamemnon exhibits the results of unrestrained passions (especially as far as Clytaemnestra is concerned) in their crudest form.

In such a violent world, the essential features of the relations between males and females are perversion, guile and violence leading to the commission of murders (perhaps the only "normal" relationship is between Cassandra and Agamemnon). If what is said above is sustained, we cannot but admit that the communication in Agamemnon is deeply problematic, not to say non-existent.

However, Aeschylus deliberately conveyed the impression that on the surface the characters communicate tolerably well because otherwise the impact of the Cassandra scene would have been severely minimised. In this scene, the divinely possessed Trojan captive and possible bedfellow of Agamemnon provides the missing links between the earlier and the future parts of the saga of the House of Atreidai and reveals

the plain truth (i.e. the King will be murdered) to the bewildered Chorus who refuse to accept it. One could hardly find a better scene to illustrate the communication breakdown between the personages of the play. The prophetess in a series of visions, whose eloquence is remarkable but whose logical connection is not always apparent, reveals the past and future horrors and hints to the personages' real intentions behind the false pretences.

In what will follow this introduction, I put emphasis on the textual evidence without forgetting to mention, wherever it seemed necessary to me, some elements of dramatic technique because I believe that every drama, let alone a highly dense one like Agamemnon, was written for theatrical performance and consequently the dramatist must have taken into account the reactions of the audience for whom the line of demarcation between the present and the past was thin since the figures of dramatic heroes were not exclusively confined to the latter (on the blending of history and myth with reference to the Oresteia see Kuhns 1962, 26, 29).

The reinterpretation of the events surrounding the regicide that Aeschylus attempted, is likely to have aroused the interest of the audience. In particular, the figure of Cassandra was probably intended to provoke the audience's perplexity from the very first moment because she does not appear in any other version of the story. On the other hand, her Oriental appearance should have struck a familiar note since the audience before and after the Persian wars had a rough idea of the Oriental outfit and mentality but no one would have been prepared for Cassandra's prophetic utterances. When she enters with Agamemnon many among the audience would expect her either to speak after a little

time (she does this in Ag.1072) or remain silent throughout the play. When she leaves in Ag.1330 to meet her death, her words do not change the course of the events but the Elders and the audience had become wiser; therefore I believe that the verses 1072-1330 are of some interest. Their examination will constitute the core of this work (all quotations to the Aeschylean text are from West 1990) .

If one wanted to summarise the Cassandra scene (Ag. 1072-1330) in the fewest possible words, the summary would inevitably include the following elements: Cassandra daughter of Priam, servant of Apollo and slave to Agamemnon comes to Argos with her master after Troy's sack. There, in a state of divine frenzy, she foretells Agamemnon's and her own death which are later accomplished by Clytaemnestra, Agamemnon's wife.

This summary, which deliberately omits any reference to controversial points, raises some questions on the linguistic and consequently on the moral level, concerning both form and meaning of her speech. The detectable moral themes in this scene do nothing but corroborate and clarify the moral broadlines of the play i.e. that guilt is inherited and infectious, as Dodds (1960, 26) convincingly argued.

As it is apparent from the summary, Cassandra is Apollo's prophetess and delivers her prophetic message based on inspiration and not on the interpretation of omens, thus distinguishing herself from the artful diviners (on this distinction see Bevan 1928, 130). The divine inspiration of Cassandra in Agamemnon is more than obvious either by her speech or by the Chorus' words (Ag. 1140-1142) *φρενομανής τις εἶ, θεοφόρητος, ἀμ-/φὶ*

δ' αὐτὰς θροεῖς/ νόμον ἄνομον... The lack of divine inspiration is perhaps the explanation for her being silent for 287 lines. Thus she transcends time and space limits and is ready to speak not when she is addressed by Clytaemnestra or by the Chorus but when she is overwhelmed by the onset of her vision (Taplin 1972, 85).

One can discern two parts in Cassandra's utterances, the *amoibaion* (Ag.1072-1177), answered by the Chorus with iambic trimeters and dochmiacs (allegedly an Aeschylean innovation see Dale ²1968, 104) and a series of plain speeches (Ag.1178-1197, Ag.1214-1241, Ag.1255-1294) interspersed with stichomythic passages with the Chorus (Ag.1202-1214, Ag.1246-1255, Ag.1299-1316) that is to say that Cassandra utters three speeches each of them followed by four lines delivered by the Chorus and a brief stichomythic passage (Conacher 1987, 41, 44).

The whole of the Cassandra scene can be perceived through a twofold movement. Cassandra is struggling for clearance and the Chorus is craving for knowledge, which is difficult for them to gain because of two reasons : the symbolic language of Cassandra and the curse of Apollo working on the prophetess. However, the two sides will come closer through the gradual development of the meaning of Cassandra's words (Lebeck 1971, 52). At the end, Cassandra and the Chorus will reach the long-awaited mutual understanding, which unfortunately brings destruction: 'Αγαμέμνωνός σέ φημ' ἐπόψεσθαι μόνον (Ag.1246) (on the reversal of the natural order and the new stage technique see Hogan 1984, 85)

CASSANDRA IN AESCHYLUS' AGAMEMNON :
LANGUAGE AND CHARACTER INTERACTION

PART I CHAPTER1: A SURVEY OF
CASSANDRA'S LANGUAGE

A WORDS SUGGESTING DIVINE MADNESS

Before Cassandra starts speaking the Chorus, in ignorance about what is going to happen, state that Cassandra needs an interpreter: *ἐρμηνέως ἔοικεν ἢ ξένη τοροῦ δεῖσθαι / τρόπος δὲ θηρὸς ὥς νειαιρέτου* (Ag1062-1063). Aeschylus ironically exploits the ambiguity of the word interpreter which can be applied both to the interpreter of languages and to the interpreter of obscure oracles (Hall 1989, 117-118). This ironic use of the word, intensified by the adjective *τοροῦ*, implies a new reversal of order. Cassandra does not need an interpreter, she is herself the interpreter of Apollo's messages which are expressed by thematic repetition, transmitted to the Chorus' eyes and ears and reinterpreted [Apollo -Cassandra (interpretation1)-Chorus (interpretation 2)]. It is evident that in this pattern of communication there is an imminent danger of misinterpretation and distortion of the message mainly from the Chorus and that is perhaps the reason for their blatant initial incompetence to understand the meaning of Cassandra's words. This incompetence becomes all the more explicable should someone take into account that Cassandra's sacerdotal language considerably resembles "glossolalia" (on this term and a classification of glossolalistic features see May 1956, 77). What is probable is that the words and the rhythmical patterns in use are more the products of conscientious learning than of improvisation although a god-

possessed woman is likely not to be able to subject her utterances to rational control.

Whatever may one infer from the previous point, the presence and prophecy of Cassandra dominate the whole part of the scene at least from the statistical standpoint as Cassandra, silent for 287 lines, speaks 37 times for 179 lines while the Chorus delivers only 91. From these statistical data, which are evidently not exhaustive, one might draw the conclusion that Aeschylus considered Cassandra's silence to be an important element of the plot of Agamemnon thus arousing the curiosity of the audience and leaving much to their imagination. He succeeded in making a greater impact on them because the girl accompanying Agamemnon on the chariot [some elements of her identity are previously known (Ag.955)] could not escape the audience's attention.

That much of the dramatic effect of the scene depended on the visual part of the dramatic composition is in my opinion incontestable because otherwise the existence of so few words denoting divine madness is inexplicable. We can divide these words into two classes : these that occur only in Agamemnon and these that occur in other Aeschylean plays. Finally there is a subdivision of the former category comprising words that do not occur anywhere else, on which opinion is sometimes a speculative task.

(i) *ENΘEOΣ*

An evocative word denoting divine madness is undoubtedly *ἐνθεος* which occurs three times in Aeschylus. In Agamemnon the word is used by the Chorus who ask about Cassandra's gift of ecstatic prophecy after she deceived Apollo

(Ag.1209) ἤδη τέχνησιν ἐνθέοις ἡρημένη. In Eumenides the Pythia uses the same word to denote the state of mind of Apollo after having been enthroned by Zeus in Delphoi (Eum.17-19) τέχνης δέ μιν Ζεὺς ἐνθεον κτίσας φρένα/ ἔξει τέταρτον τῶνδ' ἄντι μάντιν ἐν θρόνοισι/ Διὸς προφήτης δ' ἐστὶ Λοξίας πατρός. Lastly the word occurs in Septem where it makes the strongest impact. The Messenger is referring to the Argive warrior Hippomedon who will attack the fourth gate (Th. 497-498) αὐτὸς δ' ἐπηλάλαξεν, ἐνθεος δ' Ἄρει/ βακχαῖ πρὸς ἀλκὴν θυιάς ὥς, φόβον βλέπων. The proximity of ἐνθεος with the god of war and its syntactic relation to the verb βακχαῖ which denotes divine frenzy and alludes to the god Dionysus make the word in question evocative should one take into account that it also denotes the warrior whose name does not appear in the sentence. If one wanted to draw a conclusion, one could say that the word is always related to a particular god and is uttered by someone else than the person whom it denotes.

(ii) ΣΤΡΟΒΩ

This word is not directly related to divine madness but in the context where it is used, has a certain relation if not with divine madness at least with a god. Thus Cassandra uses this word to describe her condition during her second seizure by the spirit of Apollo (Ag.1215-1216) ὑπ' αὖ με δεινὸς ὀρθομαντείας πόνος /στροβεῖ τάρσων φροιμῖοις +ἐφημένους+. In this sentence the meaning of στροβεῖ is intensified by its proximity with another verb referring to a state of mental disorder (τάρσων), to say the least. It is possible that the meaning of στροβῶ (LSJ⁹ s.v.=whirl about) has something to do with the shape of the circle and possibly with the turbulence as it is perhaps the case in a passage of Choephoroi. There Electra, after reminiscing of Orestes, invokes

the gods to help them overcome their hardships (Ch.201-203) ἀλλ' εἰδότας μὲν τοὺς θεοὺς καλούμεθα, / οἷοισιν ἐν χειμῶσι ναυτίλων δίκην στροβούμεθ'. Perhaps Electra alludes to the ship which turns in circles during the storm before being wrecked by the tide. The next occurrence of the word is again in Choephoroi where the Chorus cannot perceive what Orestes can: the Erinyes of his mother are approaching him; the Chorus ask (Ch.1051-1052) τίνας σε δόξαι, φίλτατ' ἀνθρώπων πατρί/ στροβοῦσιν; .. As I said, the Chorus is ignorant of the oncoming Erinyes but if one connects the contexts, in which these words occur, perhaps one can suggest that στροβοῦσι expresses a premonition.

(iii) ΤΑΡΑΣΣΩΝ

The dual occurrence of the words στροβεῖ and ταρασσών makes it necessary to examine the use of the latter, which after all has a certain relation to people seized by divine madness. The word occurs two times in Choephoroi. In the first instance Orestes states that the Erinyes of his father do not let him rest (Ch.288-290) καὶ λύσσα καὶ μάταιος ἐκ νυκτῶν φόβος/ κινεῖ ταρασσει, καὶ διωκάθει πόλεως/ χαλκηλάτῳ πλάστιγγι λυμανθὲν δέμας. The verb here is used in climactic sequence in order to convey the impression of corporal and mental agitation. Although not semantically connected with one of the Olympian gods, it is associated with the deities of the Underworld, the Erinyes whose influence on Orestes is strong. The second occurrence of this word is where the Chorus lament Agamemnon's fate (Ch.329-331) πατέρων τε καὶ τεκόντων/ γόος ἔνδικος ματεύει / τὸ πᾶν ἀμφιλαφῆς παραχθείς. This extract is not very helpful because there is no indication that the agitation is provoked by divine force and what is more, the subject of the

participle does not give us a hint for a possible connection with a god or a deity.

(iv) *MAINOMAI*

Beyond any doubt the word which is more connected with the divine madness is the verb *μαίνομαι*. However, the evidence for the occurrence of this word in *Agamemnon* is more than scanty because it does not occur in the spoken part of the Cassandra scene. Clytaemnestra after Cassandra's obstinate refusal to comply with her orders, i.e. to enter the palace, comments on the Trojan girl's situation (*Ag.*1064-1066) *ἡ μάλινεται γε καὶ κακῶν κλύει φρενῶν, / ἥτις λιποῦσα μὲν πόλιν νεαίρετον/ ἤκει...* Clytaemnestra's statement is extremely emphatic because it has been intensified by the use of *ἡ* and *γε* of which the first is used to corroborate the statement and the second to intensify it. The meaning of *μάλινεται* is intensified also by the adjacent expression *κακῶν κλύει φρενῶν*. Thus we have a statement about Cassandra's situation before she starts speaking. What is more important is that Clytaemnestra considers the long silence of Cassandra to be a symptom of madness while the Chorus think that she does not speak because she does not know Greek. Clytaemnestra is proven to be perceptive and perhaps her ability implies an intuitive perception of the captive's condition.

A further occurrence of the word is in *Septem* where the Chorus terrified at the prospect of war against the Argives, give an account of what it might happen (*Th.*343-344) *μαινόμενος δ' ἐπιπνεῖ / λαοδάμας μαιλινων εὐσέβειαν Ἄρης*. The participle qualifies the god of war but the information that it provides us with is not very helpful because the connection of Ares with frenzy is not something expected. The Messenger has revealed

the identity of the Argive attacker who is Eteocles and the blazon on his shield. Eteocles interpreted the sign favourably to the Theban people and the Chorus comment on the boastful words of the attackers (Th483-485) *ὥς δ' ὑπέραυχα βάζουσιν ἐπὶ πτόλῃ/ μαινομέναι φρενὶ, τῶς νιν/ Ζεὺς νεμέτῳ ἐπίδοι κοταίνων*. Ares (or more probably the War) was previously in a state of frenzy ; now the attacker's minds are possessed by madness. Although no specific reference to a god has been made one could infer that it was Ares who inspired the frenzy. However, in my opinion this is not the case as it might be proven by the next reference to the textual evidence. During the second stasimon the Chorus refer in a compressed way to Oedipus' sorrowful life (Th. 778-782) *ἄρτίφρων ἐγένετο/ μέλεος ἀθλίων γάμων, / ἐπ' ἄλγχι δυσφορῶν/ μαινομέναι κραδίαι/ διδυμ' ἃ κάκ' ἐτέλεσεν/*. There is no doubt that Ares has nothing to do with the state of frenzy of Oedipus who blinded himself and cursed his sons after he discovered who he was and whom he was married to i.e when Justice was done and the Erinyes of his father had punished him; so the frenzy is generally related more to impersonal forces than to a certain god in Septem. This opinion is corroborated by Th.933 where the second semichorus (according to West [West1990,ad.loc]) lament the brothers' fate and try to detect the reasons for the mutual fratricide (Th.933-936) *ὁμόσποροι δῆτα καὶ πανώλεθροι/ διατομαῖ<σι> οὐ φίλαι/ ἔριδι μαινομέναι/ νείκεος ἐν τελευτᾷ*. The expression *ἔριδι μαινομέναι* is important for the interpretation of these verses because the mutual fratricide is attributed to or at least provoked by the frenzied Strife. The word is used again in conjunction with an abstract force of justice. This is the case for the antiphonal dirge after the death of the brothers (Th 965-967)- *πρόκεσαι - κατακτᾶς -*

ἤε' - ἤε' - μάλνεται γόοισι φρήν. If the passage is genuine, the separation of madness from a god is total because in this case the madness is attributed to wailing. Someone might raise the question of the original cause of wailing and might associate madness with a certain god or a retributory force of justice but this doubt although legitimate is a little far-fetched.

If in Septem madness is not associated with a god this can hardly be the case for the Suppliants. The Chorus narrate Io's wanderings attributed to Hera's hatred and intervention (Supp.561-564) ὕδωρ τε Νείλου νόσοις ἄθικτον, / μαινομένα πόνοις ἀτρί- / μοις ὀδύναϊς τε κεντροδα- / λήτισι, θυιάς Ἥρας. I think that there is no doubt that behind Io's madness is Hera's torturing goad which incurred all these ignominious toils to her because she and Zeus had a passionate relationship.

Last but not least I would like to make a reference to a passage in Prometheus Bound because the word *μαίνομαι* and madness are not derived from the gods but are still peculiarly connected with them. Prometheus speaks with Hermes, the messenger of the Olympians (Pr 975-977) ΠΡ ἀπλῶι λόγῳ τοὺς πάντας ἐχθαίρω θεοὺς, / ὅσοι παθόντες εὖ κακοῦσί μ' ἐκδίκως / ΕΡ κλύω σ' ἐγὼ μεμνηνόςτ' οὐ σμικρὰν νόσον. The participle is probably used here metaphorically but if its use is literal, madness is characterising someone who hates all the gods but it is not clear who is its bringer.

If the occurrence of the previous words in other Aeschylean texts can give us a hint of how Aeschylus perceived their meaning, the occurrence of a word only in one play and sometimes only in one place is not offering a strong indication on

its meaning. In this case we should have recourse to other sources

(v) ΘΕΟΦΟΡΗΤΟΣ

The word which in my opinion best denotes the state of divine madness is θεοφόρητος (Ag.1140) which means tactus divino spirito (Italie 1955, s.v.). Perhaps I should rephrase my opinion about the uniqueness of this word in Aeschylus so as to include only the extant plays because the word θεοφόρος occurs in a fragment of his lost satyr play Σίσυφος πετροκυλιστής which is probably identical with Σίσυφος δραπέτης (Weir-Smyth 1926 ,v2, fr121). In our passage Sisyphus is probably speaking: καὶ νύπτρα δὴ χρὴ θεοφόρων ποδῶν φέρειν/ λεοντοβάμων ποῦ σκάφη χαλκήλατος; I do not believe that the text allows us to connect the word θεοφόρων with divine possession; on the other hand, the meaning probably is that Sisyphus' feet bear the god i.e. Sisyphus is a god which seems acceptable to me, given the satirical tone of the play. Apart from this allusion to θεοφόρητος, all the other references to this word come from post- classical sources.

Iamblichus in his work On the mysteries in Egypt (the real title is missing) provides us with information concerning the performance of religious mysteries in Egypt where some participants are in a trance and become god-possessed. In the first passage the loss of identity under such state is discussed (Iamb. Myst.3,4,5.ff) φῆς δὲ δὴ ὡς ἐπιβάλλουσι καὶ δι' ἐνθουσιασμοῦ καὶ θεοφορίας πολλοὶ τῷ μέλλοντι, ἐγρηγορότες μὲν, ὥς ἐνεργεῖν καὶ κατ' αἴσθησιν, αὐτοῖς δὲ πάλιν οὐ παρακολουθοῦντες ἢ οὔτι γε ὡς πρότερον παρακολουθοῦντες ἑαυτοῖς. The writer gives two alternatives as far as the identity of the god-possessed is concerned : either they lose it or they assume a new one, that of the god. What is important is

the use of *πάλιν* which implies that some of these people were regularly submerged by the god. Moreover Iamblichus gives an account of the deeds the god-possessed perform (Iamb. Myst 3, 4, 13) *τά τε γάρ ἄβατα βατά γίνεται θεοφορούμενα, καὶ εἰς πῦρ φέρονται καὶ πῦρ διαπορεύονται καὶ ποταμοὺς διαπερῶσιν, ὥσπερ ἡ ἐν Κασταβάλλοις λέρεια*. The connection of divine possession with the priestess makes obvious the fact that fire plays an essential role in these rites where the god-possessed throw themselves into it and/or step on it (cf. Ag. 1256 *παπαῖ · οἶον τὸ πῦρ ἐπέρχεται {δέ μοι}*). In the third passage the author tries to explain the supernatural aspect of these deeds and denies any human intervention since human beings in trance are perceived to be an instrument of the god (Iamb. Myst. 3.7.4 ff) *οὔτε γὰρ ἀνθρώπινόν ἐστι τὸ τῆς θεοφορίας ἔργον, οὔτε ἀνθρωπίνους μορίους ἢ ἐνεργήμασι τὸ πᾶν ἔχει κύρος*. The success of these deeds is guaranteed by the god's omnipotence and by the wilful loss of identity of his worshippers.

The author of *Περὶ Ὑψους* (probably Longinus) by having recourse to the authority of Plato, admonishes the reader to emulate the writings of the great authors: (Long, Subl. 13, 2) *καὶ γε τούτου φίλτατε, ἀπρίξ ἐχώμεθα τοῦ σκοποῦ· πολλοὶ γὰρ ἀλλοτρίῳ θεοφοροῦνται πνεύματι, τὸν αὐτὸν τρόπον ὃν καὶ τὴν Πυθίαν λόγος ἔχει...* The author uses the word metaphorically but I think that we could convincingly argue that he has the divine possession in his mind since he connects the verb with the Pythia.

The compound word as an adjective and a ^{instance} participle occurs two times in Athenaeus. In the first, the writer states his belief that some proper names are related to gods (Ath Deipn 10, 448 e) *θεοφόρα · ὀνόματα οἶον Διονύσιος* and at the second time three references are made to a comedy of

Menander entitled Θεοφορούμενη (Ath Deipn, 3, 119/ Deipn, 5, 83/ Deipn, 5, 259).

In Lucian's work the word occurs two times in the form θεοφορούμενοι. In his work Philopseudeis or Ἀπιστῶν a philosophical discussion is taking place between Eucrates and Tychiades on religion and the occult: (Luc Philops. 38) *Τί γάρ σοι, ὦ Τυχιάδῃ, περὶ τῶν τοιούτων δοκεῖ, λέγω δὴ χρησμῶν καὶ θεσφάτων καὶ ὅσα θεοφορούμενοί τινες ἀναβοῶσιν ἢ ἔξ' ἀδύτων ἀκούεται ἢ παρθένος ἑμμετρα φθεγγομένη προθεσπίζει τὰ μέλλοντα;* It is important that the word stands in apposition with others denoting frequent and socially acceptable religious duties and which means that perhaps in this passage the god-possessed were not regarded as outlaws or unimportant worshippers of a god or a deity. That is not the case in his work Λούκιος ἢ ὄνος when the word occurs for the second time. Lucius had been purchased by Philebus as a slave and the next day, when they set out for work, Lucius had to carry the statue of the Syrian goddess Atargatis on his back (Luc, Asin, 13, 2) *ἐπὰν δ' εἰς κώμην τινὰ εἰσέλθοιμεν, ἐγὼ μὲν ὁ θεοφόρητος ἱστάμην, ὁ δὲ αὐλητὴς ἐφύσα ὄμιλος ἔνθεον, οἱ δὲ τὰς μίτρας ἀπορρίψαντες τὴν κεφαλὴν κάτωθεν τοῦ αὐχένος εἰλίσσοντες τοῖς ξίφεσι ἐτέμνοντο τοὺς πῆχεις καὶ τὴν γλῶτταν τῶν ὀδόντων ὑπερβάλων ἕκαστος ἔτεμνε καὶ ταύτην ὥστε ἐν ἀκαρεῖ πάντα πεπληῆσθαι μαλακοῦ αἵματος.* In my opinion, this passage is very important because although the word θεοφόρητος has probably the meaning "god-bearing", the context is that of divine possession and it is not accidental that the goddess who inspired the divine frenzy was from the Orient. The author is perhaps playing with the double meaning of the word and I believe that he views the whole scene derogatorily because the divine possession was inspired very suddenly and because of the

detailed description of its effects (we should also note that this sight must have been regular; note the construction *ἐπὶ* + optative).

In Sextus Empiricus' work the verbal form of the word occurs twice. The first time it does not denote human beings but physical phenomena deified by the Persians and the Egyptians (S.E, PhI, 9, 32) *εἶτα πάντες μὲν ἄνθρωποι τούτων ἔχουσιν ἔννοιαν, οὐχ ὡσαύτως δὲ, ἀλλὰ Πέρσαι μὲν εἰ οὕτω τύχοι, τό πῦρ θεοφοροῦσι, Αἰγύπτιοι δὲ τὸ ὕδωρ, ἄλλοι δὲ ἄλλο τι τῶν τοιούτων*. In this place the word means deify and the whole context implies a process dominated by fortune which reminds us of the cosmic Presocratic philosophers for whom the origin of the world lay in the transformation of the elements of nature. In the second passage found in the Outlines of Pyrrhonism, Sextus Empiricus tries to explain how the perception of the outer world is affected by the mental state of each person (S.E, P, 1,101) *οἷον παρὰ μὲν τὸ κατὰ φύσιν ἢ παρὰ φύσιν ἔχειν ἀνόμοια ὑποπίπτει τὰ πράγματα, ἐπεὶ οἱ μὲν φρενιτίζοντες καὶ θεοφορούμενοι δαιμόνων ἀκούειν δοκοῦσιν, ἡμεῖς δὲ οὐ*. Here the god-possessed are joint with the frenzied because they both have a distorted image of the outer world. It is said that these people believe that they hear daemones' voices; in Cassandra's case she is ordered by the god to prophesy but she is not submerged by him.

In Soranos' work about the illnesses of women, the author offers useful post-natal advice and some guidelines about the selection of nourrices (Sor, Gynaeciorum 19, 92-96) ... *διόπερ οὐ δεισιδαίμονα δεῖ καὶ θεοφόρητον εἶναι τὴν γαλοῦχον, ἵνα μὴ παραλογισθεῖσά ποτε καὶ μανιωδῶς σαλευθεῖσα κινδύνῳ τὸ βρέφος περιβάλῃ*. The junction of *δεισιδαίμονα*, *παραλογισθεῖσα* and *μανιωδῶς σαλευθεῖσα*

makes apparent, in my opinion, that in this context *θεοφόρητον* means "in a state of divine possession" ; moreover the connection of divine possession with the nourrices shows that the existence of such paranormal phenomena was not limited to the upper classes but divine inspiration was a more widely applied practice.

Plutarch has also three usages of this word. The first occurrence of the word in *Moralia* is where the writer compares the style of the contemporary and the older orators. The predilection of modern orators for bombast is deprecated: (Plut, *Mor.* 2, 45, 15 ff) οἱ δὲ τὰς ξένας φωνὰς τοῖς ἀκροατηρίοις νῦν ἐπεισάγοντες οὗτοι καὶ "θείως" καὶ "θεοφορήτως" καὶ "ἀπροσίτως" ἐπλέγοντες ὥς οὐκέτι τοῦ "καλῶς" καὶ τοῦ "σοφῶς" καὶ τοῦ "ἀληθῶς" ἐξαρκοῦντος. This passage is important for the reason that the word "θεοφορήτως" is considered to be a part of foreign vocabulary and being so, it can simply be rejected by the author on these grounds. Since Cassandra was a foreign girl, the word in question uttered by the Chorus to denote Cassandra's state of mind, would be more significant than it was previously realised if it belonged to the vocabulary of barbarians in the time when Aeschylus wrote the *Oresteia*. This word was not only applied to the inhabitants of Asia but also denoted a Roman deity.

The second occurrence of the word in *Moralia* is in a passage where the author denounces those who speak in flattering words (Plut, *Mor.* 2, 54, 10 d) Ἐν δὲ τοῖς φαύλοις οὐ παρίησιν τὸ πρωτεῖον ἀλλὰ φησι ἄν ἐκεῖνος ἢ δύσκολος αὐτὸν εἶναι μελαγχολικόν ἄν ἐκεῖνος δεισιδαίμων αὐτὸν θεοφόρητον. Since the meaning of the passage is that the flatterer tries to excel in all bad things, it is probable that *θεοφόρητος* denotes a worse state than *δεισιδαίμων* because the latter is someone whose life is affected by

his blind faith to gods whereas *θεοφόρητος* is someone whose words and actions are controlled by a divine force. This word has undoubtedly an unfavourable meaning because of its place in the text and its relation with the context since reference has been made to a person who flatters everyone all the time.

Lastly, Plutarch tries to provide his readers with a popular etymology (Volksetymologie) of the Roman deity *Καρμέντα* assimilated to *Μοῖρα* (Plut, Μορ, 2, 278 c) *Ἔστι δὲ τοῦ ὀνόματος τὸ ἔτυμον ἐστερημένη νοῦ διὰ τὰς θεοφορήσεις*. The text in this case is not clear. Was the deity mad or her worshippers god-possessed? I think both, because the expression *ἐστερημένη νοῦ* does not make sense unless we assume that the deity was originally a god-possessed figure. On the other hand, if we accept her relation with *Μοῖρα*, she cannot be a living creature but her divine frenzy which apparently was a crucial element of the myth, was transmitted through the ritual to the worshippers.

As for the existence of the word in Philodemos' work, we do not have much to say because it is fragmentary. The word *θεοφορία* can be reconstructed with some doubts in two cases. In the first of them, (Phld, Mus, fr18 B, Kemke 1884) the text runs as follows: (v. 15) *θεοφο[ρίαν ἐμ] ποιεῖν* but everything more than this is terribly uncertain. In the second case (Phld, Mus, fr 19, Kemke 1884) the context (see v. 12 *ἐλθισμένον*, v. 13 *ἐνδόμενον*) implies that perhaps the process of divine possession is discussed.

In the comparison of Dionysius of Halikarnassos between Romans and Greeks, much is said about their different religious customs. The author denounces the frenzied and bacchic aspect of the Greek rituals and seems to opt for the more restrained Roman customs (D.H, Antiquitates Romanae., 2, 19, 2)

οὐδ' ἂν ἴδοι τις, παρ' αὐτοῖς καίτοι διεφαρμένων ἤδη τῶν ἑθνῶν, οὐ θεοφορήσεις, οὐ κορυβαντισμοῖς, οὐκ ἄγνυρμούς, οὐ βακχείας καὶ τελετάς ἀπορρήτους, οὐ διαπαννυχισμούς ἐν ἱεροῖς, ἀνδρῶν σὺν γυναιξίν, οὐκ ἄλλο τῶν παραπλησίων τούτοις τερατευμάτων οὐδὲν ἄλλ' εὐλαβῶς ἅπαντα πραττόμενά τε καὶ λεγόμενα τὰ περὶ τοὺς θεοὺς, ὥς οὔτε παρ' Ἑλλήσιν οὔτε παρὰ βαρβάροις. The comparison is against the Greeks because some of their rituals are called *τερατεύματα* and because Roman rituals are more restrained even though Rome is in a state of corruption.

Strabo comments on the religious life in Comana in comparison with Antitaurus (Str12, 3, 32) *σχεδὸν δὲ τί καὶ τῇ ἀγωγῇ παραπλησίᾳ κεχρημένα τῶν τε ἱεουργιῶν καὶ τῶν θεοφοριῶν καὶ τῆς περὶ τοὺς ἱερέας τιμῆς...* and later he describes Antitaurus and the shrine of Enyo (Str12,12, 3.) *πόλις δ' ἐστὶν ἀξιόλογος, πλεῖστον μέντοι τὸ τῶν θεοφορήτων πλῆθος καὶ τὸ τῶν ἱεροδούλων ἐν αὐτῇ.* There is no doubt that the word is used here derogatorily as the author had previously said that the town was worthy of praise. Also before *θεοφορήτων* there is a *μέντοι* introducing contradiction and *θεοφορήτων* is connected with *ἱεροδούλων*. It seems that the god-possessed were considered to be a public nuisance and of course were given less credit than the official priests of the goddess.

However, where the word in question achieves its most derogatory meaning is in a passage of Strabo where Moses tries to convert people to monotheism (Str.16, 2, 36) *..καὶ παραδώσειν ὑπὸ σκηνῶν τοιοῦτον σεβασμόν καὶ τοιαύτην ἱεροποιίαν, ἥτις οὔτε δαπάναις ὀχλήσει τοὺς χρωμένους οὔτε θεοφορίαις καὶ ἄλλαις πραγματείαις ἀτόποις.* It is noteworthy that Strabo uses neither the participle nor the adjective but the compound noun *θεοφορία* which is indirectly characterised as useless and is contrasted with the

new religious duties that Moses wants to impose. Besides this, the derogatory use of *πραγματείας* intensifies the bad meaning the word had in that era, since it was considered to be a relic of paganism.

If one wanted to express an opinion about the meaning of the word *θεοφόρητος*, one would be in much difficulty because the derivatives of the word acquired a variety of meanings as the years went by. One thing seems to be sure: that the god-possessed who were socially acceptable mainly in Egypt, or at least not very culpable, were later outcast in Greece and Rome.

(vi) *ΦΡΕΝΟΜΑΝΗΣ*

In the passage of Agamemnon in question (see pp.8-9) there is another word which may denote divine madness. The word *φρενομανής* occurs two times in the extant and fragmentary Greek literature ; the first is in Aeschylus and the second is in the work of Aristodemus. There the historian gives an account of the accidental death of Coronides' daughter by Pausanias and of the following events (Aristod, Fr. 104 8,1 ff in Jacoby 1926,498) *καὶ διὰ τοῦτον ἐς μανίαν περιέστη καὶ γενόμενος φρενομανὴς ἐκεκράγει ὡς δὴ μαστιγούμενος ὑπὸ τῆς κόρης ὁ πολλοῦ δε χρόνου διαγενομένου ἐξέλασατο τοὺς δαίμονας τῆς παιδὸς καὶ οὕτως ἀποκατέστη.* The similarities with the Cassandra scene are obvious: a crime (the deception of Apollo) is punished (no one believed Cassandra's prophecies) until a supernatural force is appeased (death of Cassandra). However, a considerable difference is that Pausanias became *φρενομανής* after the killing while Cassandra was in a frenzied state when she delivered her prophetic messages, even before her deception of Apollo.

(vii) ΘΕΡΜΟΝΟΥΣ

Another word probably denoting divine madness is *θερμόνους* occurring in (Ag.1172) where Cassandra laments her city's fate and the inefficient sacrifices of her father and then refers to her prospective death *ἐγὼ δε θερμόνους τάχ' ἔμπεδωι* (sc. *Ἀιδηι*) *βαλῶ*. The problems with the interpretation of this word (which according to *Italie 1955 s.v.* means mentem ardentem habens) are considerable because it may be corrupt (see *Fraenkel 1950, 536*) and even if it is not, it is a hapax. One may conclude that Cassandra's soul is on fire (thus *Weir-Smyth 1926,101*) and may be it is an allusion to the fact that she is god - possessed.

B EXCLAMATIONS

The idea of divine madness is not solely conveyed by the use of conventional words but also by exclamations whose frequency, meaning and position are crucial factors determining the nature of Cassandra's speech. One should not be too eager to classify all these exclamations as expressions of lamentation because Aeschylus uses the same word in different contexts to convey different impressions.

(i) ᾠΑ

This exclamation is used once in Agamemnon, in the Cassandra scene where the prophetess, obviously in a state of trance admonishes (whom is extremely unclear) to keep the bull away from the cow (Ag.1125) *ᾠ ᾠ ἴδου, ἴδου ἄπεχε τᾶς βοός/ τὸν ταῦρον*. It is noteworthy that the double use of this exclamation combined with the initial vowel of the verb gives to it an emphatic tone. In Choephoroi, Orestes uses the same exclamation

twice when he perceives the Erinyes approaching him (Ch.1048). If in the two previous passages the opinion that the exclamations are used for lamentation is sustained, this could hardly be the case for the Prometheus Bound where the hero is struck by the smell of Oceanides, who are just about to make their entrance to the orchestra (Pr.114). Later on, the maddened Io gives an account of her wanderings where she uses the exclamation in question to make her hardships and her situation more explicit (Pr.566). Finally the word also occurs in Supplices where the Chorus in a long ode express their compassion for Io's fate. There a single $\delta\tilde{\alpha}$ precedes a direct invocation to Zeus, who was also responsible for Io's hardships (Supp.163). A common feature of all these references is their connection with a god or a deity against whom the heroes or the Chorus are incapable of reacting either because their physical condition does not permit it or they are not of sound mind and consequently the god's will is superior to theirs.

(ii) ΔA

Cassandra uses the exclamation $\delta\tilde{\alpha}$ at the beginning of her trance where the number and strength of exclamations are not only abundant but also repetitive (Ag.1072-1073= Ag.1076-1077) $\acute{o}\tau\acute{o}\tau\acute{o}\tau\acute{o}\tau\acute{o}\tau\acute{o}\tilde{\iota}\ \pi\acute{o}\pi\acute{o}\tilde{\iota}\ \delta\tilde{\alpha}\ \cdot\ / \ \acute{\omega}\pi\acute{o}\lambda\lambda\acute{o}\nu\ \acute{\omega}\pi\acute{o}\lambda\lambda\acute{o}\nu$. The exclamation in question does not only connect the set of exclamations with the double invocations but adds strength to the exclamation although it has only one syllable. The Trojan princess expresses her grief to Apollo for bringing her to Argos and takes no notice of the Elders' reply which makes their total inability to grasp the meaning of her words, conspicuous. In Ch. 405 the exclamation involves an invocation to the nether powers to help

the distressed children and in Eum.842 it is used by the Chorus to express their grief at being defeated and deprived of their offices. Finally the word occurs also in Pr.566 ff discussed above. In a few words, the exclamation is used to express grief but does not have a threnodic aspect .

(iii) 'ΙΟΥ

Another explanation which could denote divine madness is perhaps *ιού* ; my reservations are due to the fact that the word has a meaning associated with divine madness in Ag.1214 where Cassandra is seized again by the god and is prepared to launch another set of prophecies. In all the other cases the word is used to express grief (Eum.143, because Orestes escaped the attention of Erinyes), panic (Ch.881, because no one listened to the cries of Aegisthus' servant, announcing his master's death) and joy (Ag.25, where the Watchman after having seen the light of the torch and apprehended the message that Troy was seized by the Achaeans, calls Clytaemnestra to share his joy). This is a good example of Aeschylus' capacity to make the same word acquire different meanings according to the context. It is obvious that it is difficult to tell whether or not this exclamation initially denoted a state of divine madness or at least of mental disorder since its use by the Erinyes does not help the case very much.

(iv) ΠΑΠΑΙ

This exclamation occurs twice in the Cassandra scene and in both contexts it is emphasised either by its repetition or by the simultaneous occurrence of other similar exclamations. Cassandra has in the first place visions of the net, with the help of which the regicide will be accomplished (Ag.1114-1116) *ε' ε' παπαῖ παπαῖ, τί τόδε φαίνεται; / ἦ δίκτυόν τί γ' "Αιδου;| ἀλλ' ἄρκυς ἢ ξύνεινος.*

The absence of comma to separate the first set of exclamations from the second intensifies their effect. The second occurrence of the ejaculation in the Cassandra scene is again related to a vision, this time of fire, but the vision is not connected with a metaphor as was the case in the previous passage. However the vision of fire (Ag.1256-1257) *παπαῖ, οἶον τὸ πῦρ ἐπέρχεται {δε μοι} / ὅτοτοῖ, Λύκει' Ἀπολλων · οἶ' ἔγω' ἔγω'* is perhaps related to the sacrificial death of Agamemnon and Cassandra. The third occurrence of the exclamation is in Eumenides where the Chorus lament the matricide and the spilling of the blood on the ground (Eum.261-263) *αἶμα μητρῶιον χαμαί / δυσαγκόμιστον, παπαῖ / τὸ διερὸν πέδοι χύμενον οἴχεται*. The seclusion of the exclamation between a comma and a semi-colon and its place at the end of the verse intensify its meaning but this utterance can hardly be regarded as influenced by a divine authority. Finally the exclamation occurs also in Pers.1031-1032 *ΧΟ παπαῖ παπαῖ / ΞΕ καὶ πλέον ἢ παπαῖ μὲν οὖν* where in my opinion ^{it} achieves its maximum evocative strength because it is placed in a typical lament and is repeated in two consecutive lines by two different personages from which the second repeats and intensifies its meaning.

(v) ΠΟΠΟΙ

The exclamation *ποποῖ* occurs three times in Agamemnon; the first two times in two identical verses in Ag.1072= Ag.1076 (see p.26). The third time is related to Cassandra's vision of the future after the Chorus' attempt to prevent her from uttering new prophecies ; but she cannot refrain from speaking (Ag.1100-1103) *ὦ ποποῖ, τί ποτε μῆδεται;/ τί τόδε νέον ἄχος, μέγα/ μέγ' ἐν δόμοισι τοῖσδε μῆδεται κακόν,/ ἄφερτον φίλοισιν, δυσίατον*. The simultaneous existence of two exclamations in the

beginning of the sentence serves emphatic purposes and predisposes the audience (be it the Chorus or the spectators) for what is going to follow i.e the account of the murders that will be accomplished by Clytaemnestra.

In Choephoroi the word occurs during the dirge for Agamemnon and the exclamation is definitely used for lamentation (Ch.405-409) *πόποι δ᾽ νερτέρων τυραννίδες/ ἴδετε πολυκρατεῖς Ἄρα! +φθειμένων+/ ἴδεσθ' Ἀτρειδᾶν τὰ λοῖπ' ἀμηχάνως/ ἔχοντα καὶ δωμάτων/ ἄτιμα..* Here Orestes summons the curse of his father to take cognizance of the situation ; this is an indirect invitation to attribute justice by giving the doers their deserts. In Eumenides the word is used to express the Chorus' grief and distress (see p. 27 s.v. δ᾽). Finally, the word occurs three times in Persai where it is connected with lamentation. In the first time (Pers. 550-551) the Chorus laments the defeat of Persian military and naval forces and attribute this result to Xerxes' incompetence *Ξέρξης μὲν ἄγαγεν, ποποῦ,/ Ξέρξης δ' ἀπώλεσεν, τοτοῦ.* In the second time, the word is used by Darius in a stichomythia with his wife to express his grief because the city has been depopulated and the army devastated (Pers. 731). Finally, the exclamation is used to make a contrast between the days of Persia's prosperity and the hardships which are about to follow the destruction (Pers.852 ff).

(vi) TOTOI

Another exclamatory word possibly expressing the state of someone god -possessed is *τοτοῖ* which is found in different versions such as *ότοτοῖ*, *ότοτοτοῖ* (these versions will evidently be treated together). The word occurs in Ag.1072, Ag.1076, Ag.1257. In all these cases it is uttered by Cassandra. It is believed that this exclamation is not a real word but a more or less improvised utterance belonging to a primitive language (Heirman 1975, 261). The word occurs also in Choephoroi at the moment of Aegisthus' dying (Ch.869.) *έ έ, ότοτοτοῖ*. It is noteworthy that Aegisthus does not pronounce any other words in his time of dying except these three exclamations, which lead up to a climax since the third has four syllables. The remaining occurrences of the exclamation are in Pers.268 , Pers.274 where the Chorus grieve for the fruitlessness of the expedition against the Greeks after the Messenger's announcement of the total defeat of the Persians. This theme occurs also after the appearance of the defeated Xerxes (Pers. 919). The Chorus lament their King and the lost reputation of the Persians and think that a god is partly responsible. The exclamation is used for lamentation and /or grievance but it is not certain whether or not it denotes divine madness as there is no such indication except the three passages in Agamemnon .

(vi) 'E"E

As for the exclamatory words *έ έ* the ground is more safe because the ejaculations occur in almost all the extant tragedies and sometimes are uttered by people who can be considered to be god-possessed. They occur once in Ag.1114 but

many times in Choephoroi : Ch.869 , in Ch.1009 and in Ch.1020 where the Chorus foresee the oncoming hardships for Orestes.

In Prometheus Bound these words are solely used by Io whose state is characterised by divine madness although in a different way from that of Cassandra. The words occur in Pr.565 (see p.26) and for the second time in a passage where Io invokes Zeus and at the same time laments her fate (Pr. 578-581) *τί ποτέ μ' ὦ Κρόνιε παῖ, τί ποτε ταῖσδ' / ἐνέζευξας εὐρών
ἀμαρτοῦσαν ἐν πημοναῖσιν; ἐ' εἰ οἴστρηλάτῳ δὲ δείματι δειλαίαν / παράκοπον
ὦδε τείρεις;* Later this theme will recur with two references (Pr.598 and Pr.602) : the first is an expression of grief for her miserable state and the second is a part of a direct question, the meaning of which is that Io is more miserable than any unhappy person. In Pr. 742 she laments her fate with a mixture of exclamations and personal pronouns (*ὦ μοι μοι, ἐ' εἰ*) which make her inability to find the proper words to describe her situation all the more explicit. From all these references the most noteworthy is that of Pr.578 ff because Io in the same period refers to her past hardships but in a way foresees that there will be more in store for her.

These exclamations occur five times in Septem. The three are found in the same utterance of the Chorus (Th.150), who are terrified by the sound of the attackers' chariots and do not know to which conclusion the gods will lead the situation. They first invoke Artemis and Hera but afterwards they turn to any god that might be helpful. They occur three times in three sets of four and, in my opinion, are not directly related to a certain god or deity but are associated with a kind of vision of the Chorus about what is going to happen. This is

certainly the case for the next reference where the Chorus mistakenly foresee the defeat of the Theban army and the seizure of the town (Th 321-329) οἰκτρὸν γὰρ πόλιν ὧδ' ὠγυγίαν/ 'Αἶδαι προΐάψαι, δορὸς ἄγραν/ δουλίαν ψαφαρᾷ σποδῶι/ ὑπ' ἀνδρὸς 'Αχαιοῦ θεόθεν/ περθομέναν ἀτίμως,/ τὰς δὲ κεχειρωμένας ἄγεσθαι, ἐξ/ νέας τε καὶ παλαιάς/ ἱππηδὸν πλοκάμων, περιρ/ρηγνυμένων φάρων. What is significant is that the Chorus do not foresee only a god-sent destruction but a dishonoured one and we could infer that their "prophecy" had been applied not only to the city but also to the brothers. The last occurrence of the exclamation in Septem is at the same stasimon (Th.338) where the Chorus lament the fate of the captured city and bemoan their situation which is worse than that of the dead. All this pessimism is part of the ominous premonitions which penetrate the whole play.

In Supplices these words occur twice (Supp.142, Supp.152) in exactly the same context and in my opinion express the mixture of Chorus' joy and anxiety, because they avoided the marriage to the sons of Aegyptus but at the same time, they do not know what is going to happen.

Finally the words occur in Pers. 977 where Xerxes laments all those who were gasping for air on the shore of Attica after the naval battle of Salamis. What someone should retain is that the same exclamations are used for two different kinds of visions. In the Cassandra scene a god-possessed woman foresees a god-sent destruction that happens whereas in Septem sane women foresee a god-sent destruction that does not happen, because the two brothers are doomed to murder each other and thus save the city.

(vii) 'ΙΩ

This exclamation is the most commonly used in Agamemnon and one of the most frequent in Aeschylean tragedy. What is interesting is it is used only once before the Cassandra scene. The Chorus express their grief about Helena's kidnap which led to the Trojan war, and also their sympathy to her husband (Ag.408-413) *..πολλὰ δ' ἔστενον/ τόδ' ἐννέποντες δόμων προφήται·/ ἰὼ, ἰὼ δῶμα δῶμα καὶ πρόμοι, / ἰὼ λέχος καὶ στίβοι φιλόνορες./ πάρεστι σιγὰς ἀτίμους ἀλοιδόρους ἀλγίστους ἀφημένων ἰδεῖν·* ". The use of the exclamations is significant because 1/: their double use and also the double use of the same word *δῶμα* emphasize the fact that Helena's kidnap will have severe consequences for the house of Atreidai and 2/ because the exclamations are used in a context more or less similar to that of the Cassandra scene: that of knowledge concerning the past. The first time Cassandra uses this expression is when she rages against Clytaemnestra for her guile against her husband (Ag.1107-1109) *ἰὼ τάλαινα, τόδε γὰρ τελεῖς; / τον ὁμοδέμιον πόσιν/ λουτροῖς ἔ φαιδρύνασα πῶς φράσω τέλος;* The use of this exclamation and its proximity with the adjective *τάλαινα* qualifying Clytaemnestra is strange on the surface but it may suggest that Cassandra's feelings towards Clytaemnestra are perhaps not exclusively those of bitter enmity. Later on, (Ag.1136) Cassandra curiously laments her and Procne's fate because (Ag.1146) she says that gods gave Procne sweet life without tears whereas death is in store for her. The difference between her past and her present life is apparent when she laments her city and Paris' marriage (Ag.1156-1157). Another occurrence of the exclamation is where she laments her father and his fruitless sacrifices (Ag.1167, Ag.1169). Later on she does the

same but this time including Priam's children (Ag.1305) *ὦ πάτερ σοῦ σῶν τε γενναίων τέκνων*. The second part of this verse is at least curious since she does not exclude Paris from her reference which means that she regards him as *γενναῖον* too although she scorned him earlier. Another peculiar occurrence of the exclamation is where Cassandra seems to be determined to face her own death (Ag.1313-1316) *ἀλλ' εἶμι κὰν δόμοισι κωκύσουσ' ἐμήνι Ἀγαμέμνονός τε μοῖραν · ἀρκεῖτω βίος./ ὦ ξένοι./ οὔτοι δυσολίῳ θάμνον ὥς ὄρνις φόβωι*. Since she is not afraid of dying why is she using this exclamation which is used often for lamentation^t? And why is it occupying half of the verse? In my opinion, the influence of divine madness gives a poor justification for this inconsistency since nothing suggests that at the end of the speech Cassandra is possessed by Apollo. Cassandra's last words include a general reflection (rhesis) on the course of human life, where the exclamation of grief is totally justified (Ag.1327).

The Chorus after Agamemnon's death and Clytaemnestra's justification of her deed launch a lament for Agamemnon in which many motifs are interwoven. They reproach Helen for making many souls perish (Ag.1455 ff). In all these cases the use of the exclamation is totally justified.

In Choephoroi the exclamation occurs five times. Electra's rage against her mother who dared to bury her father without lamentation is made explicit (Ch.429-433) *ὦ, ὦ δαῖα/ πάντολμε μάτερ, δαίαις ἐν ἐκφοραῖς/ ἄνευ πολιτῶν ἀνακτ',/ ἄνευ πενθημάτων/ ἔτλας ἀνοίμωκτον ἄνδρα θάψαι*. There is no doubt that the exclamation does not denote sympathy but hatred. The exclamation is pronounced again by Electra (Ch.462) to summon the gods to judge the case fairly. Its last two occurrences take

place in the same chunk of the Chorus' speech (Ch.469-470) where being frightened by Electra's threats, they implicitly foresee the disasters looming ahead *ὦ δύστον' ἄφερτα κήδη' ὦ δυσκατάπαντον ἄλγος*. If a passage in Choephoroi bears some resemblance with the Cassandra scene, it must be this because a vision of the future occurs in veiled words and at the same time the exclamation *ὦ* is used.

In Eumenides the exclamation occurs in two passages. In the first, the Chorus reproach Apollo for having shown respect for someone who killed his own mother and is not respecting the gods (Eum.149 ff). It is obvious that the exclamation is not used for lamentation but for the expression of distrust towards the god. Later the Furies who seek vengeance deplore their fate (Eum.791) and in this case the exclamation is justified but there is no mention of prospective vengeance.

In Prometheus Bound, the exclamation occurs only once (Pr.694) where the Chorus lament Io's fate after Prometheus' account of her new wanderings.

In Supplices the Chorus reveal their anxiety when Danaus tells them that a voting procedure will take place to decide whether they should stay or leave. The Chorus invoke the land (Supp.776) *ὦ γὰρ βοῦνι, πάνδικον σέβας*. Although they do not know what their lot will be, they state their deplorable position in case of an unfavourable outcome of the voting procedure.

In Persai the exclamation occurs in many forms: *ὦ*, *ὦὰ*, *ὦῆ* and it is used mainly for lamentation. The lament comprises everyone involved in the expedition against Greece: the defeated King (Pers.908-909), the chieftains of the

army (Pers.1004), the gods (Pers.1005), the land (Pers.1069) and the citizens (Pers.1070-1071).

In Septem the word occurs many times.

According to the Aristophanic Aeschylus, the play was *μεστόν* **Ἀρεως* (Ar. Ran.1021) and consequently it is not unusual that this exclamation will be frequently used for lamentation. In the aftermath of the mutual fratricide the second semichorus express their grief for the Curse having come true (Th.845) and lament all those who were involved willy-nilly in this strife, notably the two sisters and the two brothers the latter because they caused each other so much pain and destroyed the palace and the royal line. The latter motif reappears in Th.951 but this time the bringer of destruction is the curse of Oedipus. From there on, there is abundance of *ὠ* exclamations referring to the brothers, the fate of Oedipus, the hardships they incurred each other, the city and the *Ἀγέ* of Oedipus. In all the cases the exclamation is used for lamentation but is associated neither with divine madness nor with the vision either of the past or of the future.

(ix) *ΦΕΥ*

Another common exclamation in the Cassandra scene is *φεῦ*. Its first use is in the parallelism of Cassandra with a nightingale made by the Chorus (Ag.1142-1145) *..οἷά τις ξουθά/ ἀκόρετος βοᾷς, φεῦ, φιλοίκτοις φρεσίν/ "Ιτυν "Ιτυν στένουσ' ἀμφιθαλῇ κακοῖς/ ἀηδῶν βίον*. The inclusion of the exclamation in question between two commas intensifies its meaning, which is denied by Cassandra since she believes that she is in a worse condition than Procne (Ag.1146 ff). In this case the meaning of *φεῦ* is not adequate to express Cassandra's grief, as death awaits her. Although towards the end of the scene, she declared her intention

of not delivering a dirge, she did not avoid it in the course of her presence on stage. After the regicide the exclamation is used in two passages (Ag.1448, Ag.1484) where the Chorus lament the fate of the King and where they rage against the daemon responsible for the disaster.

In Choephoroi the exclamation occurs three times. Electra wishes the lock of Orestes hair had spoken to her (Ch.195). The last two occurrences are in Ch.396 where the plotters conspire against Clytaemnestra and wish Zeus had smashed the usurper's heads. The exclamations in both cases are not used for lamentation but express in the first case grief and in the second the combination of grief with their wish for retribution, which constitutes a basic motif of the Aeschylean tragedy.

In Eumenides after the unfavourable decision of the Athenian court, the Chorus grieve about their defeat and express their intention of sending a disease (Eum. 781= Eum.811). The same motif reappears in Eum.837 and in Eum.870 after Athena's proposal to the Chorus to become benign^d nt. The same thematical pattern of repetitive expressions of grief occurs in Eum.839 and in Eum.874. The repetition of set phrases by the Chorus despite Athena's attempt for reconciliation indicates Aeschylus' intention of making them seem more obstinate thus making their final volte- face dramatically more efficient .

In Persai , the exclamation occurs many times and is used for lamentation because this is appropriate in a play dealing with the consequences of the Persian defeat at Salamis, where the plot is static and where the excessive lamentations are a feature characterising the Asiatic way of thinking. The

Messenger grieves because Athens was responsible for the devastation of the Persian army (Pers.285) ; the Chorus lament all those who survived the naval battle and died afterwards on shore (Pers.568, Pers.576). Darius mourns because a mighty power made Xerxes lose his mind and sound judgement (Pers.725) and because the meaning of the oracle was very soon fulfilled through the god-sent destruction (Pers.739).

In Prometheus Bound the hero mourns about his present and future hardships (Pr.99) and expresses his feelings at the approaching Oceanides (Pr.124). After accounting to the Chorus all his hardships, the latter express their sympathy and their surprise because they did not expect to be moved by the hardships of other people.

Finally in Septem the exclamation occurs in three passages. After the announcement by the Scout that the enemy is coming, the Chorus invoke Zeus, Athena, Poseidon and Ares in order to be protectors of the city. However, the invocation to Ares presents a special interest (Th.136-137) *σύ τ' Ἀρης + φεῦ φεῦ ἐπώνυμον Κάδμου+πόλιν φύλαξον κήδεσά τ' ἐναργῶς*. At first sight it is peculiar that the invocation is accompanied by an exclamation mainly used for lamentation but if one takes into account that Ares is the bringer of destruction of the two brothers, the reasons for the proximity become apparent. The exclamation is also used by Eteocles (Th.597) to lament Amphiaras' fate because he supported impious men and although he was a prophet, he was unable to foresee his own doom. After the end of the scene between the Herald and Antigone, which did not end in reconciliation, the first semichorus express their grief (Th.1054) because another conflict is about to begin.

After this survey of the exclamations used in the Cassandra scene, I think that one could argue convincingly that some of them are not exclusively used to denote divine influence and/ or madness. However, given the primordial role of the gods in Aeschylus, it is legitimate to say that in some circumstances some of these exclamations are used to express opinions about some past and future events and in this respect their use in different trilogies bears some similarity with their use by Cassandra but we have to bear in mind that Cassandra's case is unique. She is a god-possessed person who knows the past and predicts the future. In other cases we have god-possessed people who know past events but do not predict the future ones (Io) and we have ordinary people who know past events and predict future events either openly (Chorus in Choephoroi) or in veiled terms (Chorus in Agamemnon). The last category includes people who do not predict the future or predict it unsuccessfully (e.g. Chorus in Septem, Chorus in Eumenides).

C IMAGERY

If the exclamations cannot give us a clear picture of the divine influence on Cassandra, the imagery in the Cassandra scene can be proven very helpful as far as the consistency of her words is concerned. The information that will be extracted from this survey may also be used in order to perceive how Aeschylus reverses the order in nature and which are the results of this reversal.

As far as the imagery is concerned, Knox (Knox 1979, 46) remarked that the images are magnificent but unconnected and prove that the prophetess is deranged. It is here argued that their loose connection is only external but not

internal. Perhaps it will be better to start the survey by the images concerning the palace which is described as *μισόθειον*,... *πολλά συνίστορα*,... *άνδροσφαγεῖον*, *πεδορραντήριον* (Ag.1090-1092). As far as the last two words are concerned one could notice the correspondence of Cassandra's words with Clytaemnestra's. In this way Cassandra's *άνδροσφαγεῖον* and *πεδορραντήριον* echo Clytaemnestra's *χερνίβων* (Ag.1037) and *μῆλα πρὸς σφαγὰς* (Ag.1057) respectively (on this see Zeitlin 1965, 468). Moreover the correspondence between *πεδορραντήριον* and *χερνίβων* is not only thematic but also semantic because *πεδορραντήριον* is synonymous with *περιρραντήριον* the vase used for the sprinkling of water before the sacrifice (Moreau 1985, 89). If the imagery concerning the palace bears some coherence, this is not the case for the imagery concerning the animals, which occupy the most important place in the language of Cassandra. The situation is as follows:

AGAMEMNON: *ταῦρος* (Ag.1126) , *λέων εὐγενής* (Ag.1259)

CLYTAEMNESTRA : *βοῦς* (Ag.1125) , *κύων* (Ag.1228) , *ἀμφίσβαινα*, *Σκύλλα* (Ag.1232) *δίπους λέαινα* (Ag.1258) , CASSANDRA: *κύων* [by the Chorus] (Ag.1093) , *ἀηδών* [by the Chorus] (Ag.1145) , *βοῦς θεήλατος* (Ag.1297-1298) [by the Chorus] , *ὄρνις* (Ag.1316)

AEGISTHUS : *λέων ἀναλκίς* (Ag.1224) , *λύκος* (Ag.1259). At first sight it is apparent that many metaphors are used, the same metaphor is used for more than one person and some metaphors are unintelligible or against the natural order. It is obvious that most of the metaphors concern Clytaemnestra (five references) , Cassandra occupies the second place (four references) three of which are metaphors used by the Chorus for her. Agamemnon and Aegisthus occupy the last place with two references.

Clytaemnestra is described as *βοῦς* and so is Cassandra;

Clytaemnestra is presented as *κύων* and so is Cassandra by the Chorus. It is interesting that the only similarities between Cassandra and the Queen are brought together not by the Trojan girl but by the Chorus, who perhaps are made by Aeschylus to express some common features between the two female characters of the play. As for the imagery of the lion the situation is complicated because Clytaemnestra is depicted as *δίπους λέαινα* (why she is two-footed only in this case I can not understand), Agamemnon is depicted as *λέων εύγενής* and lastly Aegisthus is portrayed as *λέων άναλκis*. I will not discuss here the significance of the lion cub parable (see Lebeck 1971, 47-51) but suffice it to say that the lion parable is introduced with reference to Helen (*Ag.*717-718) and is used for every figure who acts stealthily as an instrument of Erinyes. Agamemnon and Clytaemnestra were apparently harmless but both of them prepared doom for each other ; Agamemnon's succumbing to the yoke of the necessity made him sacrifice his daughter and undertake the blood- stained expedition while Clytaemnestra's approval of the law of retributory justice urged her to kill her husband, thus provoking her own death. The lion metaphor used for Aegisthus is strange because the adjective *άναλκis* is incompatible with the notion of lion. Aegisthus is also likened to a wolf because he is a plunderer and an usurper (Higgins 1976, 202) and coincidentally (?) one of the cultic titles of Apollo is Lykeios. Perhaps it is relevant to say that according to a branch of the tradition Danaos built the shrine of Apollo Lykeios because of an omen according to which a wolf fell upon a herd and slew its leader. We cannot decide yet whether *Λύκειος* is connected with Lycia or with the wolf or with

both but we will say a few words when we deal with the question of the origins of Apollo and his worship (pp.51-55).

When one uses a metaphor, one tries to explain something wholly or partly unknown by relating it to something known. However, Aeschylus stretches metaphorical language when he likens Clytaemnestra to an *ἀμφίσβαινα* and *Σκύλλα* because these creatures do not exist or rather they are a figment of people's imagination. The poet does not alter only the essence of the metaphors but also the natural order of the animal world. Only rarely can someone find in nature a coward lion or a cow killing a bull. As far as the latter example is concerned some scholars suggested that the word *μελαγκέρωι* (Ag.1127) is related to Clytaemnestra's portrayal as a cow (Young 1974, 141, Verrall 1889,130) but I do not think that someone can find many cows with horns ; unlike cows, all bulls have horns and consequently if the relation is sustained, we have a transformation of Clytaemnestra into a bull one line after her being likened to a cow.

Should one want to reach a conclusion about the imagery in the Cassandra scene, one will have to admit that some of the metaphors are either inconsistent or redundant whereas some others run counter to our beliefs about the relations among the animals. Perhaps Aeschylus was not interested in the consistency of metaphors concerning a person throughout the scene but he preferred using the metaphors as an end in themselves thus creating a magnificent dramatic impact on some parts of the scene. On the other hand, this liberty was well-suited to the motif of the god-possessed Cassandra who is presented as deranged because of her inconsistencies throughout the scene although her visions are perfectly consistent in broad lines

D RE C U R R E N T M O T I F S

The struggle for the transmission of Cassandra's message is expressed by thematic repetition and by emphasis on the need for clear interpretation. It is necessary to make a brief survey of the main themes which are repeated throughout her scene without surveying again all the previous metaphors.

Given the relation between Apollo and her, it is not surprising that his name is subjected to repetitions either explicit or allusive. Apollo is mentioned many times (Ag.1073, Ag.1076 , Ag.1080, Ag.1085 ,Ag.1202 , Ag.1248, Ag.1257) in two forms either only his name or his name preceded by an adjective referring to one of his characteristic features. His name is also used in puns and alliterations which refer to Cassandra's fate (Ag.1081-1082) ... ἀγυιᾶτ', ἀπόλλων ἐμός· ἀπώλεσας γὰρ οὐ μόλις τὸ δεύτερον.

The motif of song is also repeated many times with two different subjects : Cassandra and the Erinyes. In both cases the song is about doom but in the first case Cassandra will sing her own funeral song whereas in the second case the Erinyes will sing the doom of Clytaemnestra and Agamemnon. Another significant difference is that Cassandra being likened to a nightingale (Ag.1146), will sing a tuneful song while the song of Erinyes will not be melodious (Ag.1187).

The need for clear interpretation of the message of Apollo occurs two times (Ag.1178) καὶ μὴν ὁ χρησμὸς οὐκέτ' ἐκ καλυμμάτων ἔσται and (Ag.1183) ..φρενώσω δ' οὐκέτ' ἐξ αἰνιγμάτων but Cassandra defies the logic of her utterances and keeps speaking with riddles.

The pattern of repetition is also used for emphatic purposes : *χέρ ἐκ ' χερὸς* (Ag.1110- 1111), *γάμοι, γάμοι Πάριδος* (Ag.1156) , *ὑμνοῦσι ὕμνον* [Erinyes] (Ag.1191) , *ἔπειθον οὐδέν ' οὐδέν* (Ag.1212) , *μάντις μάντιν* (Ag.1275)

However, the most important repetitive motif is that of the inescapable fate which is likened to a disease difficult to cure (Ag.1102-1104) : *μέγ ' ἐν δόμοισι τοῖσδε μήδεται* (sc. Clytaemnestra) *κακόν, φίλοισιν/ δυσίατον· ἀλκὰ δ' / ἐκὰς ἀποστατεῖ*, (Ag.1169-1170) : *..ἄκος δ' / οὐδέν ἐπήρκεσαν* , (Ag. 1248) : *ἀλλ ' οὔτι Παιῶν τῶιδ' ἐπιστατεῖ λόγῳ* , (Ag.1299) : *οὐκ ἔστ' ἄλυσις, οὐ ξένοι, χρόνῳ πλέον*. This motif does not appear in the Cassandra scene for the first time but it is here that Aeschylus puts so much stress on it because Cassandra's speech is the last link in a chain of events which will lead to Agamemnon's murder.

E VERBS AND SUBORDINATE CLAUSES

It has been suggested that Cassandra has a global perception of time (de Romilly 1968, 79). This opinion is plausible because in Cassandra's speech the past, the present and the future cannot be easily recognisable since she regards the sequence of events as a fait accompli and comments on it. It is not fortuitous that during her scene she uses 55 verbs (my survey excludes infinitives and participles) denoting the present,¹⁹ denoting the past and only 12 verbs denoting the future. From these numerical data we can infer that Cassandra's perception of time is more or less conforming to this pattern: Past- Present and Future. This pattern is important because it approaches the present to the past and is included to the broader pattern of hereditary guilt in which the past affects the present and foretells the future. Cassandra's prophetic gift is peculiar because prophets

(*πρό + φημι*) usually display their accurate knowledge of the future but do not put much stress on the detailed account of the past. However, in our case, Cassandra's reference to the past is extremely important both technically and dramatically because in the first place it serves the poet's purpose to reverse Apollo's curse on Cassandra i.e to make her credible and reliable and in the second place because the initial mistakes of the Atreidai pave the way for Agamemnon's death, thus justifying the pattern of hereditary guilt and retributory justice.

Perhaps it is about time we examined the linkage of Cassandra's words. Cassandra uses 15 subordinate clauses with the following distributory system: two clauses expressing result, two similes, three time clauses, two clauses expressing reference, five parabolic sentences (elliptical) and one conditional clause. From this piece of evidence some conclusions could be drawn : Cassandra uses relatively few subordinate clauses (15 in 179 lines), has frequent recourse to allusive and elliptical language (2 similes and 5 elliptical parabolic sentences) and uses relatively often time clauses, which means that the notion of time is for her the factor which determines the course of events because as time elapses, new crimes are added to the old and lead up to the climax of the play. It is evident that in all the other cases the linking of Cassandra's thought is performed by commas, particles and connectors. The small number of subordinate clauses suggests that the external connection of her thoughts is not tight but the connection between the constituents of her thoughts is strong except maybe in one case (see p.42).

F DIRECT QUESTIONS

Most of my previous remarks suggest that the external sequence of Cassandra's thoughts is sometimes problematic. I intend to show that problems arise as far as the recipients of Cassandra's words are concerned. In my opinion, the direct questions she uses are a good example illustrating Cassandra's inability to communicate with the Chorus. Cassandra uses seventeen while the Chorus ^{use} fourteen. Since only Cassandra and the Chorus are present during the scene, one could naturally suppose that Cassandra's questions would be addressed to them but her questions do not fulfil their purpose because she does not ask for information but tries to communicate her message which the Chorus are unable to understand so they cannot reply. In most of the cases, the questions are addressed to Apollo or to herself and are rhetorical ; from the seventeen direct questions only three are addressed to the Chorus (Ag.1194-1195 (bis) and Ag.1218) of which the latter is rhetorical. It is not coincidental that good communication between her and the Chorus is established during the first stichomythia where the Chorus inquire about her relation to Apollo. In the second stichomythia, there are problems (Ag.1251-1254) *XOP τίνος πρὸς ἀνδρὸς τοῦτ' ἄγος πορσύνεται; / ΚΑΣ ἦ κάρτα <μακ>ρὰν παρεκόπης χρησμῶν ἐμῶν / XOP τοῦ γὰρ τελούντος οὐ ξυνῆκα μηχανήν / ΚΑΣ καὶ μὴν ἄγαν γ' Ἕλληνας ἐπίσταμαι φάτιν.* The situation is worsened in the third stichomythia (Ag.1304-1305) *XOP ἀλλ' εὐκλεῶς τοι κατθανεῖν χάρις βροτῶι / ΚΑΣ ὦ πάτερ, σοῦ σῶν τε γενναίων τέκνων.* If the vital element of stichomythia is the interaction between the speakers, I have little hesitation to say that Aeschylus abolishes the quintessence of it

because even though Cassandra and the Chorus are on stage, there is a communication breakdown.

Perhaps Aeschylus' predilection for the reversal of the natural order was extended to the abolition of the meaning of stichomythia. Aeschylus' treatment of the Chorus in relation to Cassandra is characterised by his intention of making them a dramatic figure whose purpose is to give Cassandra the incentive to speak and to communicate the god's terrible message. The Chorus lend a sympathetic ear to Cassandra's utterances and provide her through their questions, with a stimulus to speak; from there on, they try to grasp the meaning of her words although she is not always addressing them. The process of decipherment of Cassandra's riddles and veiled phrases is continued throughout the whole scene but the Elders reach the truth only when it is too late to alter the course of events, i.e. to prevent Agamemnon's death.

I think that from the above analysis it can reasonably be argued that Aeschylus used both verbal and non-verbal means to transmit Cassandra's prophetic message. The former had been more thoroughly examined and the results point to the opinion that although Cassandra speaks, we cannot maintain that she and the Chorus communicate, despite her divine inspiration and the Chorus' striving for knowledge. Apart from confirming her accurate knowledge of the past, the Elders are unable to grasp the meaning of her prophecy even though they considered her to be a reliable prophet and implicitly expressed their ominous forebodings about the king's fate in earlier parts of the play. Aeschylus made them "forget" what they have previously thought and I think that we cannot speak of an

inconsistency because otherwise the dramatic effect of the Cassandra scene would have been severely diminished.

PART I CHAPTER 2: THE RELATION BETWEEN CASSANDRA AND APOLLO

It is obvious that the language is not an end in itself but is used to communicate messages and to establish relations between the speaker and his/her outer world. Especially in Cassandra's case the main purpose of her speech (if one can discern a purpose) is to transmit her message but due to her priesthood, the language that she uses reveals either explicitly or implicitly her relation to Apollo. From the text we learn that Cassandra deceived him by going back on her word to bear him children and to become his servant so the god made her prophetic gift useless and from then on no one believed her. How that happened no one knows but it is a convention every well-intentioned reader has to accept.

The question that logically arises is how the god fell in love with Cassandra and tried to take her by force. In this case some evidence from research on the cult of Apollo is helpful. It is attested that some women were joined to a god as the only husband they had and this relationship was so binding that any maiden who broke her promise was severely punished. At the shrine of Apollo at Patara in Lycia the prophetess was regarded as the *παλλακή* of the god. Should one remember that Cassandra was a Trojan and that Patara is a place in Asia Minor, one could speak of a possible connection as Kovacs (1987, 331-332) does. However, no one knows when this motif (the god and his maiden-servant) has passed into literary accounts ; Parke (1988, 57) suggested that it dates from Stesichorus' Oresteia or from the Cypria.

The breach of Cassandra's word highlights her personality: she is guilty firstly because she is a member of the Trojan royal family and one of its member's violated the rule of hospitality (Helen's kidnap) and secondly because she broke her promise to the god. According to a branch of tradition, Cassandra prophesied the fall of Troy but no one believed her and if this statement has some bearing, then Cassandra's fault incurred both individual and communal disaster (for parallels see Parker 1983, 273) even though she seems to admit her deception (*ξυναινέσασα Λοξίαν ἐψευσάμην* *Ag.*1208). However, the motif of divine implacability which dominates the scene of Cassandra, is necessary for the plot because if the god had forgiven her, the impact of her presence would have been severely reduced.

Cassandra's relation to the god can also be revealed if one pays some attention to her allusive language and invocations to Apollo. The fact that she will die virgin makes her a bride of Hades, a common term in funerary practice which alludes to Persephone as Foley (1985, 87) argues. Also Cassandra's portrayal as a nightingale is very apt because they were both servants of Apollo (Thomson ²1966, 92). The puns Cassandra uses offer a good opportunity to study the god's relation to her. The word play on Apollo's name (*Ag.* 1080-1081 = *Ag.*1085-1086) *Ἀπολλων .. ἀπόλλων ἐμός* is important because it reveals that in this case Apollo is named after his action, since he is Cassandra's destroyer (for parallels see Smethurst 1989, 163 n. 43). The word play of *ἀγυιᾶτ' ἥγαγες* (*Ag.* 1086-1087) is also informing because the cult of Agyieus perhaps arose from a primitive conception of the threshold, which was used for pledges with the guardian divinity i.e Apollo (see Farnell 1907, v 2, 149).

The same scholar believes that the motif came from the north southwards perhaps through the sea and connects Agyieus with his argument that Cassandra is distressed because she remembered the dangerous sea voyage from Troy to Argos (Farnell 1907, v 2 ,148-151). Although this is an ingenious connection of the two elements, I do not think that the desperate state of Cassandra permits her to be alarmed remembering the sea voyage; perhaps she sees the statue of Apollo Agyieus and tries to pledge with him in order to be saved from death, just as Clytaemnestra tries to make a deal with the daemon of the house to appease him and to make him desist from sending his never-ending curse.

As far as the invocation *Λύκει* ' *Ἀπόλλων* is concerned, Fraenkel (1950, 581) remarked that Apollo was not protecting people specifically from wolves but generally against any misfortunes. However, he does not inform us why Apollo was initially and specifically named Lykeios. Apollo in the Oresteia is both the bringer of destruction (in Agamemnon and Choephoroi) and the saviour of Orestes from his pursuit by the Erinyes (in Eumenides). He was the cause of Cassandra's divine madness and her liberator since he brought her to Argos to meet her death. Dionysus also incurred and healed madness (Βάκχος καὶ Λύσιος)(see Dodds 1944, xiv) but no one can be sure as to the origins of the motif of divine madness because it is related to the origins of Apollo and the debate about his connection with Dionysus.

The question of the origins of Apollo and of his relation with Dionysus are two of the most difficult problems for the historian of Greek religion and although they are

tangential to our study, should capture our attention for a while because Cassandra is a priestess of Apollo and there are some features of her figure (mainly her ecstatic prophecy) which are commonly associated with the cult of Dionysus.

Nilsson (1925,132-133) argued that both gods were cultural products of a non-Greek movement after which the Greek religious thought returned to a more rationalistic system. The main problems with this opinion are in the first place that the scholar tacitly assumes that both gods came to Greece or mingled at the same time although they have significant differences and in the second place credits both of them with irrational elements whether same or different. On the other hand, Nilsson's statement about the non-Greek gods could be accepted although perhaps more specification was needed. This task has been partially carried out by Guthrie who believes in the Asiatic origin of Apollo because he appears at the mainland cultic centres as an intruder (see Guthrie 1977, 84) while this is not always the case for the islands and Asia Minor. Then he proceeds (Guthrie 1977, 204) to say that perhaps Apollo's home was in North-East Siberia as he discovered similarities between shamanistic and Apolline ecstatic elements and identified the land of Hyperboreans with the aforementioned area. How Guthrie reached these conclusions is not very clear and moreover what is less clear is how he compared shamanistic ecstatic phenomena with the Apolline cult. Needless to say a legend like that of Hyperboreans is not the best ground for conclusions of this sort since it is very elusive. Moreover the association of Apollo with the god of gates and columns (Apollo Agyieus ?) mentioned in two Hittite inscriptions (Guthrie 1977, 86) and with a god of similar name in Lydian

inscriptions (Chantraine 1953, 68) are not extremely enlightening because it is not necessary that the land of Hittites should be Apollo's fatherland and in the second case we are talking about a mere resemblance.

About the legend of Hyperboreans one could have much to say but I think that despite possible distortions of it, in all its versions the Hyperboreans who perhaps (if the common etymology is accepted) lived northwards were not regarded as barbarians and when they have names, all of them are Greek as Farnell argues (1907, v 4, 100-101). If this theory is correct, then we could establish as region of the origins of Apollo a place in the north. We should also note that according to a version of the legend, Apollo went to his homeland of Hyperboreans in the time when Dionysus was present at Delphoi and as Farnell (1907, v 4, 102) suggests the Hyperboreans were but members of the sacerdotal order of Apollo who carried ritual offerings from one community to another.

As we see, the problem of the origins of Apollo should be approached in conjunction with the trend of migrations on Greek soil and perhaps we should be less dependent on Eastern material unless we can find evidence connecting the region of North-East Siberia with Greece in the remotest possible time but until then judgment on this aspect of the subject should be suspended. Shall we try to find another Eastern route which does better justice to the evidence? Farnell (1907, v 4, 119) referred to the Hellenisation of Lycia going back to the prehistoric period and perhaps that could be a viable hypothesis to explain the diffusion of Apolline worship in Asia Minor. However, the evidence for this period is extremely scanty and moreover if we give credence to

Parke (1985, 187), a recent bilingual inscription demonstrates that the Lycian god's name is not or is in the best case quite different from "Apollo" so the god cannot have been known to Greeks from Lycia (see Craik 1980, 157 arguing about the early connections of Apollo with Lycia).

Given the above analysis, we can reasonably argue that the Eastern evidence on the origin of Apollo is scanty and sometimes unreliable so may be it is better to direct our investigation towards a more "Greek" source. It is widely known that in the Iliad Apollo is in favour of the Trojans and even if we are talking about literature, where poetic conventions are common currency, the Apolline cult is likely to have been known to the people in the area of Troad. The problem is whether this trend started in Homer's time or reflects an earlier strand of religious history but since the Homeric poems do not constitute a beginning but a mature phase of Greek thought, perhaps it would be safer to conclude that this element is likely to have been earlier than the composition of the Iliad and the problem which now arises is how early the acquaintance of Troad and Asia Minor with Apollo is. The problem becomes much more interesting if we take into account that Arcadia, the only place in Peloponnese unscathed by the migratory trend which undermined the Mycenaean civilisation, had almost no sanctuaries of Apollo. This last element unavoidably connects the discussion with the so called "Dorian invasion" (more on this pp. 66-71). Has Apollo been brought by the "Dorians" after the latter's acquaintance with him in Asia Minor as Poulsen (1920, 11) believes or should we look for another process? A lot will depend on whether or not Apollo was known to the Mycenaeans. Although it has been contended that

they knew Apollo whose cult has been imported from Crete due to the latter's contacts with the East (see Dietrich 1974, 154, 244, Myres 1930, 237, Guthrie 1935, 39) the name of Apollo has not yet been identified on the Linear B tablets (Garland 1992, 25). There can be little doubt that there was an influence of Crete on Mycenaean civilisation as far as religious beliefs were concerned but to claim that Apollo came from Crete is quite another thing and since we do not have any concrete evidence on the existence of Apollo in the Mycenaean era it is better to be on our guard about that issue.

Since the evidence of both East and mainland Greece is inconclusive, the least implausible explanation of the acquaintance of Greece with Apollo is in my opinion that he was introduced shortly before (the scribes of the tablets have not managed to indicate his late presence) or after the collapse of Mycenaean civilisation (we have not written evidence afterwards for a considerable period of time). Who was responsible for it will be discussed in appropriate way later but suffice it here to say that perhaps the generators of this religious change came from the north and it is possible that the Hyperborean land and its legend was an artistic reminiscence of this process. Even if we accept Farnell's view (see p. 52), the transference of gifts from one community to another implies a process of migration on a small scale. This "import" must have occurred without tremendous problems since the religious system of the Myceneans had not been significantly different from that of the historical period of Greece. Even if this explanation does better justice to the evidence than the others, we still have to find one for the

"Eastern" motif of the ecstatic prophecy and to inquire whether or not it was connected with the advent of Dionysus.

The student of the cult of Apollo has to face the problem of parallel existence of Apollo and Dionysus at Delphoi where they were worshipped on alternative basis but Dionysus did not have any claims on Apollo's prerogative of prophecy because, when the latter was absent, no oracles were given according to Latte (1940, 11-12). If this opinion is sustained, then it constitutes a certain kind of proof that Apollo's cult was more powerful in this respect than Dionysus'. However, our problem remains the same because we have not established yet which god preceded which but if we remember the legend about the takeover of the Delphic oracle by Apollo, then perhaps we could arrive somewhere.

It is known that before Apollo came to Delphoi, the place was dedicated to the cult of Ge and the intruder had to slay the dragon Python. What this cult of Ge and Python was about, no one can be sure but we cannot be far away from reality if we say that it may have been chthonic and contained ecstatic elements since Cretan and Mycenaean religion were quite acquainted with them (on this see Parke 1946, 12). The fight then between Apollo and Python is perhaps a mythological representation of a religious breakthrough in the region of Delphoi but we cannot give any safe chronological evidence for this occurrence although I strongly suspect that since neither Apollo nor Dionysus can be identified on the Mycenaean tablets (Guthrie 1959, 41 has made an attempt for Dionysus but he was not sure for the outcome) the takeover from Apollo must have taken place after the end of the Mycenaean era. This conclusion does not

necessarily imply that the cult of Ge and Python was existent by that time because as Fontenrose (1959, 468) argued, the earlier champion who prevailed over Python might have been called either Deukalion, Lykos, Lykoios (this is another possible piece of evidence about the "riddle" of Apollo Lykeios and we should add here that perhaps the shrine of Apollo Lyceios in Lycia was founded by the Telchinian Lykos see on that Craik 1980,156) and Pyrrhos and if we believe Farnell (1907, v 4, 61) that the wolf-god has entered the political life before the collapse of Mycenaean civilisation, then our hypothesis gains more ground.

The intrusion of Apollo into Delphoi perhaps little before or after the migrations that signalled the end of the Mycenaean era (if we admit that the people who were responsible for them stayed for a while in Central Greece) might have resulted in his appropriation of the prerogatives of the earlier champion, and consequently of Ge and Python, but this process had not been completed before the advent of the second intruder named Dionysus. Since the latter's nature was much more chthonic than Apollo's and was often represented as a snake as Fontenrose (1959, 378) contends, it was easier for him to be assimilated with Python and to gain a place at Delphoi.

I think that now we could reasonably argue that Dionysus was a later deity than Apollo and that it is probable that the gift of ecstatic prophesy had not been originated from Dionysiac worship. Nilsson (1925, 204) had taken a small step towards solving the problem by arguing that Apollo learnt the art of ecstatic prophesy by wandering prophets without specifying where they came from, what they preached and moreover without explaining satisfactorily the fact that ecstatic prophecy

has been a part of Apolline worship even where no connection with Dionysus is noted (Parke 1985, 29-30 had argued that in the archaic period the shrine of Apollo in Branchidae issued oracles in the first person and he advanced the theory that the oracular procedure involved divine possession but I cannot totally subscribe to his point of view because the first person might have been used to give more authority to the message). The element of ecstatic prophecy is likely to have been known also to Minoans as Minoan gems-cultic objects associated with the worship of Ge-show.

So when Apollo arrived at Delphoi, it is likely that he found the ecstatic element already existent there, though perhaps subdued, and the advent of Dionysus, given his Eastern affinities, must have amplified it but we cannot say that Dionysus was the god who conferred the gift of ecstatic prophecy upon Apollo. However, the Delphic oracular procedure cannot be identified with ecstatic prophecy although the Pythia was in a state of divine influence. As for the shrines of Apollo in Asia Minor, the ecstatic element must have been more conspicuous because of their immediate contact with countries of the East where it was more widespread than in mainland Greece. Whether or not we are willing to admit more or less influence on Apolline cult by Dionysus, the process must have ended by the fifth century B.C. since by that time the two gods were no longer enemies and their features, at least as far as Delphoi were concerned, were mingled (Guthrie 1977, 31). Moreover, in mystic literature which owes a lot to the Orphic movement, these two gods were more approximated (Guthrie 1935, 43 argues that they

were both identified with the Sun= Helios but I cannot say that the idea of identification seems plausible to me).

From the above analysis I think it has become sufficiently clear that the ecstatic element in Cassandra's figure cannot be attributed to influence from Dionysus but it should rather be connected with Apollo.

After all, we should not treat Cassandra as a Delphic priestess of Apollo but we should take into account that she comes from Troy which gives to her spontaneous prophetic message more impact on the Chorus especially if we take into account that they are somehow aware of her prophetic gift (Ag.1098-1099) and instead of asking her to predict the future, as the Delphic procedure was, she spontaneously delivered her prophetic message, involving a lengthy narration of the past events concerning the house of the Atreidai.

The theme of divine madness was also used by Aeschylus in Xantriai, the plot of which concerns a relic of religious history, the fight between Apolline and Dionysiac worship, which perhaps influenced the Euripidean portrayal of Cassandra in Dionysiac terms (see Tro. 169, Tro.306-307, Tro.349-408). Davreux (1942, 88) argues that Cassandra was perhaps an independent deity whose cult was confined to a city as her cult in Amyclai was attested but when the Apolline cult was introduced in Greece, she became submerged by it. I have to express my doubts about this opinion because if Cassandra were an earlier deity, Apollo would be supposed to have appropriated some elements of her identity but I have not found any such indication; as for her cult in Amyclai maybe its introduction was influenced by the diffusion of the Homeric Iliad or rather the post

Homeric literature about the return of the heroes of the Trojan war and particularly of Agamemnon.

We have previously seen how Aeschylus perceived Cassandra's guilt and its implications. However, her guilt reaches the point of sacrilege when she defiles her formal attire and breaks the god's insignia, especially since she is his prophetess. Cassandra not only breaks her oath to be a faithful servant of the god but commits a breach of the laws of divine property (Fraenkel 1950, 585). Her impious action demonstrates that her prophetic gift was bitter and her trampling on her outer garment assimilates her fate to Agamemnon's since he also committed an act of transgression by trampling on the purple carpet. The parallelism between her and Agamemnon gains more strength should one bear in mind that her garment is perhaps an agrenon, a net-like robe for the priest which reminds the audience of the net imagery (Sider 1978, 16).

Since her fate was predetermined, Aeschylus tried to overload it by mistakes for which she alone was responsible and suggests that her faults like Agamemnon's worked cumulatively to prepare their doom by Clytaemnestra. However, Cassandra, unlike Agamemnon, died after having been aware of Clytaemnestra's perfidious plot. Apollo gave her the gift to decipher the Queen's riddles only to realise better that she is going to die.

In all the cases in extant tragedy a divine agency drives the protagonist mad (Bennett 1978, 93) but in my opinion it is extremely simplistic to explain the acts of the personages only with reference to a divine agency and without any mention of the individual responsibility for the performance of certain deeds. In

our case Cassandra sees herself as a secondary figure and her sacrifice was not premeditated by Clytaemnestra but occurred coincidentally. However, even though she is god-possessed she is not the mere vehicle of divine frenzy, which would have reduced the tragic veracity of the scene (Mason 1959, 86) but although her communication with the Chorus is not ideal she is aware of her surroundings and her personality is not submerged by the god since Cassandra can distinguish between herself and the god. Although she has knowledge of the future, she cannot intervene to alter the course of the events and from this standpoint she is useless (Gagarin 1974, 95) but being at the same time the messenger of the god and the prophet of her own doom (Vicaire 1963, 352) she can be characterised as the catalyst of the whole play. Acting like a messenger in advance (Leahy 1969, 145) she links the past, the present and the future of the house of Atreidai thus highlighting the power of retributory justice and the inevitability of the future.

Aeschylus took the motif of divine ἐνθουσιασμός (the term was allegedly coined by Democritus see Rosen 1968, 84) and transformed it from a collective submergence by the deity into the individual's lucid knowledge of the past, awareness of the present and prediction of the future. This multitemporal aspect of Cassandra's speech gives to her personality its tragic dimensions because her fate is sealed by the god. However, Aeschylus perhaps overlooked a detail, i.e. that the person who gradually acquires knowledge of his fate (e.g. Oedipus) is more tragic than the person who has knowledge of his/ her fate from before; but sometimes a traditional element is difficult to disregard.

PART II : CASSANDRA THE BARBARIAN

INTRODUCTION

In the first part of this study we discussed Cassandra's "timeless" perception of time. Now it can be said that the abolition of explicit distinction between the present, the past and the future characterises myth in general whose structure refers simultaneously to all three fractions of time (Lévi-Strauss² 1974, 231). According to Cassandra, all the history of the House of Atreidai, or at least its main events, follows an exemplary pattern and therefore should be brought into the fore in a time of double crisis, that of herself and of the house of Atreus. This mental procedure, characteristic of the primitive way of thinking (Eliade² 1970, 44), forgets all non-mythical events thus isolating all the mythical and tries to present their deep structure and the packages of relations (on this term see Lévi- Strauss² 1974, 234) between their constituent elements.

It is apparent that from the infinite number of myths, the likeliest to survive are these which are associated with the central institutions of archaic society or with matters of vital concern as Bremmer (1987, 3) argues. We have no way of knowing when the core of Oresteia was conceived (some hints will be given later) but if some elements are attested in the Mycenaean time when the core of many myths was formed then we can tread on more safe ground. As far as the figure of Cassandra is concerned, if we connect the representation of semi-divine figures on various artefacts of Early Greece with the fact that Greek mythology contained from its very beginning many primitive elements perhaps we could account for their existence

in the presentation of Cassandra's figure by Aeschylus. On the other hand if we consider the complex network of communication between Greece and the East (on this see Burkert 1987, 30) and transformation of the elements of the myth, then perhaps we could explain the existence of both Oriental and primitive elements in Cassandra's personality devised by Aeschylus in a more "advanced" society in which philosophy and magic coexisted for quite a long time (see Lloyd 1979, 49). Should all the previous be given due consideration, the antithetical relation expressed by the pattern Cassandra the barbarian v Argive Greeks will be treated in a less polarised way and with due respect to the primitive elements of Cassandra's figure whose distinction from the Oriental is almost impossible. A brief reference to some doctrines about the opposition between Greeks and Barbarians as well as to some elements that Aeschylus inherited from the tradition before him, would be necessary.

1 GREEKS V BARBARIANS UNTIL THE TIME OF AESCHYLUS

The use of the word *βαρβαρόφωνοι* in Homer implies that the poet was aware of a sort of difference between Greeks and Barbarians. However, this judgment should not be made without caution because the word *Ἕλληγ* is not used to denote all the inhabitants of the then Greece but only those of a certain area (Central Thessaly) and secondly the cultural and political antithesis between Barbarians and Greeks does not exist but until much later, in Herodotus' time as Weiler (1968, 21-22) argues. The opposition of Greeks to the totalitarian regimes of the East was a strong reason for the derogatory meaning that the word *βάρβαρος* acquired in later times. If one wants to push the

antithesis further, one could say that because of the previous reason, the meaning of the word "barbarian" approximated to that of the slave either literally or metaphorically or both. It is possible that the notions of barbarian and slave were of Eastern origin because the great markets of Asia Minor provided many slaves, some of whom were prisoners of war. Asia was also to be reproached because of its inhabitants' softness, primitivism and savagery. No wonder then that in Cassandra three identities coincide : that of the prisoner of war, barbarian and slave. The fact that Cassandra is considered to be a barbarian can also be attributed to the ancient conception of the universe as of quite modest dimensions as Dodds (1973, 182) and Reverdin (1961, 91) argue ; consequently Greeks did not find a lot of difficulty in terming someone even in few respects alien as barbarian. However, this does not mean that the Greeks were living in seclusion because it is beyond any doubt that Greek and Eastern culture had established communication dating from the Mycenaean era, the poetry of which *must* have had a lot in common with Eastern poetry. That means that some motifs were perhaps common to Eastern poetry and Homer, echoing the Bronze Age theory and practice and from there they were handed down in the poetry of the classical age (on this process see Webster 1958, 64, 69). Thus it is not surprising that the figure of Cassandra is charged with so many symbolic features which perhaps owe their existence in part to the communication between East and Greece (on the acquaintance of the Greeks with the legal practice of the East see Lloyd 1979, 241). This kind of proximity is corroborated by the greater knowledge of Homer about the Eastern Mediterranean than about its western point

(maybe it is due to the Greek migrations in Asia Minor in L.H.IIIB). However, I should say here that the Homeric poems do not reflect only a single era but they have incorporated various elements from different historical periods together with some fictitious elements. It is noticeable that in Homer the idea of the unity of mankind is prevalent and after a long period of tension will become prevalent again (see Baldry 1961, 171) .

Given this communication with the East it was not very difficult for the Greeks to acquire a relatively good knowledge of some aspects of these civilisations (on the Greek's religious borrowings see Dietrich 1974, 32 who argues that the Homeric genealogy and hierarchisation of the gods were borrowed from the East) and to term all the inhabitants of these lands, even though with some of them they had a lot in common, as "barbarians" with no initial intention of offending them.

As time elapsed and the Greek and "barbarian" interests became conflicting with culminating point the Persian Wars, the term changed meaning and was used to denote people of inferior status. Three were the characteristics that opposed Greeks to barbarians : external appearance (the barbarians were luxuriously dressed), political difference (democracy versus totalitarianism) and the philosophical antagonism, because Greeks thought that barbarians lacked *σωφροσύνη* and *λόγος* (Baslez 1984, 188-189). A stranger always provokes contradictory feelings but if he/she has a different culture then the negative feelings prevail. Thus the Greeks, for whom the boundaries between myth and history were not always distinct, projected their animosity towards barbarians retrospectively in some of their myths. As far as Aeschylus is concerned, saying that in every case he showed

his contempt for barbarians is to reduce the tragic playwright to a mere propagandist. Aeschylus managed to avoid the two common types of errors that exist in germ in category oversimplification : 1/ that opposites are mutually exclusive and 2/ that similarity is assimilated to identity (on these see Lloyd 1966, 434).

2 APOLLO AND ORIENTAL/ PRIMITIVE THOUGHT

In the first part of my study I have noticed (p.60) that the relation between Apollo and Cassandra is not one of submergence of the latter by the former. It is time I examined some aspects of Apollo and their affinities with the theory and practice of primitive thought .

Prophetic inspiration, no one can exclude divination as well, is perhaps an earlier phenomenon than both Dionysus and Apollo (Gernet 1981, 55) and consequently must have very little to do with the the ecstasy of shamans and medicine men (see the opposite opinions of Eliade 1951, 349, 1976, 273 , Halliday 1913, 59). If this opinion is sustained, perhaps we should trace the beginning of divination in a much more primitive social and historical strand and perhaps we should be less eager to argue about the possibility of a cultural loan from Egypt (thus Delcourt 1934, 240). Nilsson (1951, 21) proposed that the religion of the prehellenic population contained elements of ecstatic tendency which became less numerous when the more sober religion of the invading Dorians was introduced.

We should question two elements from Nilsson's view: he talks about a "Dorian invasion" and in second place he assumes that their religion was more "civilised" but both elements underwent close scrutiny from the scholars. First of all the expression "Dorian invasion" is somehow misleading because we do not know the exact conditions under which the Mycenaean civilisation collapsed and we cannot say with accuracy whether or not an invasion occurred, what was its extent and who were its generators. Cook (1962, 18-19) presents the basic features of the

"Dorian invasion" which were the political, linguistic and military domination of the Dorians on one hand but on the other hand he does not discern any significant alteration as far as cult, myth and material culture were concerned and concludes that apart from being the cause of the collapse of Mycenaean civilisation, the Dorians were unimportant. It is surprising that such an invasion did not change the culture of the dominated at all, an opinion leading us to discuss the two possible alternatives that of Cook and that arguing that a "Dorian invasion", at least as we, the moderns, understand the term, never took place. In the first case one would have to express awkwardness because an otherwise unimportant tribe rendered the Mycenaean civilisation into ruins without changing the material and cultural background of them. Dietrich (1974, 203) argues that dominion does not necessarily imply radical alteration of the customs but his view does not make good sense to me when applied to an invasion from abroad but it does in terms of an internal strife or of a mixture of both, which is another possible explanation.

Chadwick (1956, 48) noted that the new language that the Dorians brought was not unintelligible to the serfs because it was not significantly different from their own and in a later article (Chadwick 1976, 104) he was able to discern in the Linear B tablets a dialect ancestral to Doric which meant that the Dorians were known to Myceneans for the reason that a considerable strand of the population spoke a form of Doric. The theory of Chadwick was supported by Hopper (1976, 179) who explained the collapse of the Mycen^{ea}n civilisation only in terms of domestic policy and put a lot of emphasis on the revolt of the "Dorian subjects". However no one can know for sure who were

the subjugated because it is difficult to discern one strand from another due to the mixture of the population as Hammond (Hammond 1976, 129) argues and on the other hand the trace of proto-Doric that Chadwick found in the Linear B tablets was subject to revision by van Soesbergen (1981, 43) who claimed that the possible existence of this strand can be attributed either to scribal mistakes or to analogy.

Even if we accept the theory of Chadwick and Hopper, the obvious question is why these peoples were found there and a possible suggestion is that they came during the two migratory trends in c.1900 B.C. and 1600 B.C and when the Myceneans entered the scene of history perhaps subjugated them but the latter regained their place causing the end of their master's reign. However, one could hardly support the theory that the subjugated "Dorians" rebelled against their much more powerful masters. Moreover, there is no evidence of a transfer of populations, let alone a foreign invasion, in the Mycenean world in L.H.IIIB; on the contrary there is textual, although literary, and archaeological evidence of internal strife among some Mycenean lords resulting in the gradual weakening of the central authority which made the Myceneans more vulnerable as Desborough claimed (1964, 243). Perhaps it was then that the subjugated (whoever these were) found the opportunity to revolt. That much of the "internal factor" contributing to the collapse of the Myceneans.

The problem is that we find difficulties in explaining the end of the Mycenean era only in terms of internal conflict without having recourse to an external factor but the evidence either of material remains or customs does not imply

any Dorian arrival in Peloponnese (see Cook 1962, 17, Dietrich 1974, 204). However, we should take into consideration that the alleged fortifications on the north borderline of Peloponnese could imply a fear of an invasion from the north but it is not yet ascertained whether the wall was meant to protect the land from an attack or was a part of the road according to Hooker (1976, 148). If this is a protecting wall, then how is it going to be reconciled with the revolt of the subjugated proto-Dorians? Moreover how could someone account for the contemporaneous desertions of many sites in Peloponnese? I think that an external threat was imminent and the difficulty lies in specifying its origin.

Desborough (1964, 238) believes that the invasion was carried out by the Sea-Raiders, also held responsible for destructions in the East and Egypt, assisted by natives who fled the place after the destructions in L.H.IIB but in my opinion we need not suppose that a foreign invasion took place if we take into account firstly that we do not have any solid evidence and secondly that the pastoralist north-western invaders were equally unacquainted with Mycenaean culture before their migration. Now the problem is that we have to find out if and how these people entered the soil of the Peloponnese in L.H.IIC, which is the period during which in all probability the Mycenaean civilisation collapsed. If we accept as Hammond does (Hammond ³1975, 886) that the north-western pastoralists after wandering in the North-Western Greece occupied the area which was later called Doris, then this opinion entails that they became neighbours of the already weakened Mycenaeans, for whom the danger of an attack was imminent. Shall we then speak of a twofold process that is to say of a Dorian invasion and of internal feud? If we want to

support this theory, we have to explain in the first place how the admittedly pastoralist north-western "Dorians" learnt the art of sea-faring and in the second place the massive depopulation of the Mycenaean centres. If we accept Chadwick's and Hopper's view, about the relation between the invading "Dorians" and the "proto-Doric speaking population" of the Peloponnese, the massive depopulation remains unexplained. Chadwick (1976, 105, 115) tries to resolve the difficulty by attributing the invasion to non-Greeks, probably acquainted with naval expeditions and admitting Dorians into Mycenaean soil after the collapse of the Mycenaeans but this theory engenders more problems than it solves since Chadwick does not specify who these non-Greeks were, why they fled Peloponnese, and how the "Dorians" appeared afterwards.

At the present stage, my feeling is that the Mycenaean civilisation showed signs of weakness in the aftermath of the Trojan War, due to internal strife (partially reflected in the post-Homeric literature) that broke out. This turmoil gave the appropriate incitement to the oppressed subjects of the Mycenaean kings to claim their rights. The process was culminated with the raid of north-western, Greek-speaking peoples, collectively and mistakenly known as "Dorians". Which of these factors contributed the most is unknown. Desborough (1964, 231), Drews (1988, 216) and Hooker (1976, 173) believe that the catastrophe had already taken place because of the revolt of the subjugated but in my opinion a system so well-organised and so oppressive as the Mycenaean cannot collapse to such great extent (Finley 1970, 60 argues that from Thessaly to Laconia at least twelve palaces were destroyed) by the masses of serfs unless the latter have some sort of support from outside or a foreign military

intervention takes place. However, I am ready to admit that this intervention is possible not to have been extremely extensive because of the disintegration of the Mycenaean palatial system as a result of the internal strife and of the pressure of the subjugated peoples.

Since the cultural evidence of a possible religious change from the end of the Mycenaean period until the eighth century B.C is extremely scanty and as far as the "Dorian invasion" is concerned, we are not yet entitled to speak of an opinion, then perhaps the only safe statement that we could make is that the Apolline cult was perhaps associated at some point of its history with the theory and practice of divination .

The question that arises in the Oresteia is how from the Homeric Apollo, a god who helps his friends and harms his enemies, we pass into this two-faced god and moreover why Apollo is harming Cassandra, who is his worshipper and prophetess. No one can ignore the dramatic necessity imposing her cruel punishment because any other alternative would be inconceivable. However, the idea of divine hostility towards Cassandra who wanted to remain virgin does not seem well-founded if we do not take into account the religious progress that occurred from the archaic to the classical age. During this transitional period the precariousness of human condition was emphasised and was inextricably connected with the subject of divine hostility. The primitive conception of time and space that the ancient Greeks had (see Dodds 1951, 29) and the development of the Orphic theory of guilt, which emphasized the hereditary guilt of the individual, although on a different level from that of

tragedy, were the landmarks of this religious change according to Parker (1983, 201).

We have mentioned the "Orphic theory of guilt" but this expression needs clarification because someone might think that the Orphics were a religious sect in the modern sense with a textbook and prescribed rituals that were handed down to us and this is not exactly the case. Not only our evidence for the existence of an Orphic community is scanty according to Guthrie (1935, 11) but also the textbooks of Orphism are of dubious chronology and authorship; so each time we use the collective noun "Orphics" we should be aware of these reservations.

In archaic Greece, Orpheus was thought to be a religious teacher and magician (on his dual nature see Segal 1989, 17) and his "poems" were considered to be almost pre-Homeric, an opinion disapproved by Linforth (1941, 169) on the grounds that the ideas expressed there could not have gained the approval of people in pre-Homeric Greece. It is better not to be as categorical as Linforth because the evidence for pre-Homeric literature is more than scanty but we have to admit that the three main elements of the Orphic doctrine as outlined by Guthrie (1935, 196) that is to say, the composite origin of mankind, Dionysiac and Titanic, the hope of final apotheosis and the transmigration of souls, are signs of advanced religious thought and unlikely to characterise the pre-Homeric period ; on the contrary they seem to be influenced by the Hesiodic thought about the succession of different generations and the decadence of the present one. The first impression that one has of the teachings of the Orphics is that they appeal to the mystical side of human nature and are not compatible with rationalism but on the other hand, if we believe

that there is any connection between the legendary Orpheus and the founder of the sect, then we see that Orpheus in all the versions of his legend was associated with Apollo by being either his son or his worshipper. Can a mythical figure be associated both with Apollo and Dionysus at the same time?. If we remember what we have just said about the relation between them and the ecstatic element of Apolline religion (see pp.55-58) and that Orpheus was admittedly a dweller in Thrace, it is likely that his ideas served perhaps as a catalyst towards the reconciliation of the two gods (there is no need to suppose as Robbins 1982, 9 does that Orpheus was a shaman associated with the cult of Mother-Goddess in the second millennium B.C. because we do not have solid evidence of his existence in that era and of his chthonic associations. One could possibly mention his descent to Hades but we must remember that it was never successful either because he disobeyed the gods' orders or because the latter had cheated him). However, if we discard this evidence, it is still not sure whether this story preceded or followed the foundation of the Orphic sects. However, we need not suppose that the Orphic religion was solely responsible for this development because I think that this could have started before its formation. However, its contribution was perhaps to put the coping stone on this procedure. The time of the completion of this process is possible to have been the archaic age with its predilection for cathartic and ascetic theories as Nilsson (1935, 184) convincingly argues. On moral grounds, the most significant contribution of "Orphism" was its theory of the original sin of human nature, its emphasis on human guilt and consequently on Dike and punishment since we have to gain redemption from the primordial sin of having been born with

Titanic nature in order to regain our Dionysiac nature. Moreover, the Orphic doctrine of the transmigration of souls brings the notion of hereditary guilt into the fore since the offspring bear the sins of their forefathers and/ or are responsible for the apportionment of guilt and justice to those who wronged their family line.

However, after the Persian Wars the Orphics lost their appeal to men's souls in the first place because a less demanding religion, with which the Orphics were not at ease, had become predominant and in second place because Orphism set excessive requirements for the admission of believers who were not always eager to accept the Orphic authority in all matters of worship and belief.

Despite the decline of Orphism, its opinions on sin and redemption exercised a profound influence on the cultural development of Greece and perhaps it is possible that the talionic law which dominates the action of the Oresteia has some affinities with the "Orphic" theory of guilt.

The latter moral theory was treated in Aeschylean tragedy and especially in the Oresteia, where the paradoxical law of shedding blood for blood predominates in the first two plays of the trilogy, where four deaths occurred; the last two ordained by Apollo, who claimed to have executed orders given by Zeus. During the course of the trilogy Apollo will undergo a serious transformation from the vindictive deity who ordained murders and inspired divine frenzy in his prophetess to a conciliatory force which will contribute to the changes witnessed at the end of Eumenides. Apollo who inspired possession, a belief of pre-Greek times or of the seventh century B.C as W, Smith

(1965, 403) argues is the supporter of the order expounded by the Olympian gods. I think that it can reasonably be argued that the poet had in mind the primitive aspect of Apollo's cult, whose fame was panhellenic from the eighth century B.C (Andrewes 1967, 241). If we also take into account the affinities between Apollo and Orestes (both were murderers and later became purified see Eliade 1979, 268), then I think that Aeschylus could not find a better divine authority to connect with Orestes and his hardships.

3 AESCHYLUS AND SOME TRADITIONAL MOTIFS

However, this was not the only debt of Aeschylus to the tradition. Since the distinction between myth and history was not always clear it is possible to support the idea that the core of the myth had its roots in a remote historical period and since it was known that certain events had happened, it was natural for the poet to produce a drama in which the catastrophes were fated to occur (Greene 1944, 89). By this I do not want to imply that the conception of Cassandra was an early element of the myth of the house of Atreus because in my opinion it is not, since it occupies a secondary place in the course of trilogy. However, we should not be indifferent to the fact that the names of Tantalus, Thyestes and Orestes as well as a derivative from Atreus have been recognised on the Pylos tablets (Webster 1958, 121). No one knows if the myth of Atreus was known at that time but the existence of these names points to an affirmative answer. It is not improbable that Aeschylus knew Agamemnon as a hero with many different cultic practices all over Greece and with strong connections to the local shrines

especially if we take into account that the interest of Delphoi in the Atreid legend had already begun before the writing of the Oresteia by Stesichorus as Fontenrose (1978, 109) argues. We have already seen some general elements that Aeschylus had in mind when he composed his trilogy. It remains to find some other elements which could be used as links between the different parts of the myth and which have of course some bearing on the Cassandra scene.

The transition from primitivism to a more civilised view of the world which also comprises the opposition between Greek and barbarian attitudes are themes which call for extensive treatment in successive steps and for skilful manipulation of the theme of divine intervention since the plot is conceived in terms of general human behaviour (Hall 1989, 217, Rosenmeyer 1955, 257). These elements can give to the drama trilogic unity and explain why the dramatic and moral conflicts are treated on a step by step basis.

As I have previously said, the Cassandra scene must have been an Aeschylean innovation because except from the hint in Pindar, nowhere else is it said that Cassandra prophesied her own doom outside the palace of Agamemnon (Mason 1959, 86). However, this does not mean that some aspects of Cassandra's personality were not "traditional". The fact that in her the slave, the captive and the barbarian coincide is not fortuitous ; perhaps it is useful to say that according to the Greeks, the cities of slaves were located in barbarian territories or in Crete (Vidal- Nacquet 1981, 189). If we take one step further we can say that according to Foley (1984, 134, 141) the Greeks perceived women as inimical to culture and consequently it is easy to

imagine a woman who is at the same time a barbarian, a slave and most importantly a prophetess.

It is useful to say that the figure of Sibyl (another servant and prophetess of Apollo) is connected with the epic tradition in two ways, firstly because the words of Sibylline oracles were thought to be plagiarisms from the epic tradition and in the second place because a legendary motif attached to Sibyl appears in the Epic Cycle and the Homeric Hymns i.e the penalty which befalls the maiden who promises Apollo her favours and then withholds them. If one thinks Parke's opinion (1988, 51, 55) that Apollo's love for Cassandra dates perhaps from the Cypria to be sustained, then the debt of Aeschylus to the tradition becomes apparent.

I think that by now it has become clear that the position of Cassandra in the course of action of the Oresteia is an Aeschylean innovation but some aspects of Cassandra's personality date from much earlier. Despite the common belief, I believe that Aeschylus, examined very thoroughly the tradition and presented on stage a character whose mere presence might recall ancient beliefs and cultic practices and whose personality is brilliantly incorporated into the plot and the theology of the Oresteia in a way that suited the moral conflicts that Aeschylus might have wanted to stage.

It may be argued that, in Aeschylus' world view, a predominant feature of civilisation is the hierarchisation of values according to which men are subordinate to gods, barbarians to Greeks and women to men, although I have a lot of reservations about the function of the third pattern especially in

Agamemnon (on this feature of Aeschylean theology see Zeitlin 1978, 149).

To come back to the Oresteia, I could argue that the purpose of Aeschylus was to pose the problem of the moral government of the universe using as a pretext the bitter experiences of the members of the house of Atreus, originated from the ancestral guilt with the contribution of divine intervention and human responsibility (see Rose 1946, 6). In such a universe where the relations between its constituent elements are tight, it would be wrong to isolate one and claim that this element is the sole responsible for the action as all the factors are closely interdependent. However, should someone insist on finding the predominant factor of the trilogy, I think that the divine forces occupy the most important place but even these forces are subordinate to what Aeschylus planned to focus on or to leave into the background i.e. to the plot. Saying as Scott (1984, 150) does that the gods do not act in accord with fixed principles but rather react to individual crises is to somehow overlook the trilogic and progressive aspect of the Oresteia. The transition from the world of Agamemnon to the world of Eumenides affects even the gods who at the beginning demand blood for blood but at the end become exponents of the judicial procedure of the courts. So the gods probably act according to principles which undergo a change throughout the trilogy.

We could say that as far as the structure of the play is concerned, the scene of Cassandra is only an episode in the movement of the action. This stems from her inability to alter the course of the events because of the divine curse (Weir-Smyth 1924, 157). Cassandra will not be believed by the Chorus and will

prophecy her own death. Aeschylus created the most Homeric of all personages in the trilogy according to Macleod (1983, 45) in a very un-Homeric setting. Cassandra is a victim, just like Agamemnon and Clytaemnestra although she is quite different from them. Macleod (1983, 38) says that she is the victim of the arrogance of her divine lover but I believe that Cassandra had gone back on her word towards the god and had to be punished. From then on, the way that she chose to die, that is to say, with full knowledge of her fate, was the "sympathetic" aspect of her personality.

The momentary hesitation of Agamemnon before entering the palace is a prefiguration of the delirious and prophetic song of Cassandra who from the beginning of her appearance (note the words *βάρβαρον* [Ag.1051] and *καρβάνωι* [Ag. 1061] probably of Eastern origin) did not show much contact with the moral and cultural environment of the Argive land as de Romilly (1959, 75) argues.

4 ORIENTAL AND/OR PRIMITIVE ELEMENTS IN THE CASSANDRA SCENE

The Oriental and / or primitive elements of Cassandra will be examined according to the factors of appearance, form and meaning although I am aware of the dangers of isolation and selective treatment of elements that constitute a unity but this will be done in order to avoid confusion emerging from the treatment of numerous elements in a compressed way. The discussion will close with a reappraisal of the title of this part of our study .

A APPEARANCE

Cassandra will enter Agamemnon's palace as perhaps his concubine, although not very much is said on that point. The relation between her and her master from a sexual standpoint accords with the archaic moral code and is not a fifth century convention (Jones 1962,116). However, no one should be surprised by Aeschylus' digression from the moral code of his era because a potential sexual relationship between Agamemnon and Cassandra would provide better justification for the atrocious regicide devised by Clytaemnestra. It is surprising that the entrance of Cassandra is unprepared since the Herald did not mention anything about her so as to make the dramatic impact of her presence stronger (Taplin 1977 a, 305). The woman would probably enter on the same chariot with Agamemnon although this point is left unclear. The figure alone of Cassandra will create in the audience a deep impression. This is the first time that the third actor is used to facilitate the dramatic movement rather than to be an active participant (Michelini 1984, 136) but the

audience will note that perhaps Cassandra is to remain a mute person because she stays silent for a long time. On the other hand, if she were a mute person and probably secondary, how could someone account for her possible presence on a chariot and especially that of Agamemnon? The bewilderment of the Chorus is increased by Cassandra's outfit. From the way she is dressed it is apparent that her office is higher and that she is not just an insignificant prisoner of war. Thomson (²1946, 47) argued that the function of clothes to protect the body is connected with magical practices and beliefs and this opinion is justified in Cassandra's case since she is a prophetess who will soon be in a state of divine frenzy. It is believed that Cassandra wore a saffron or a purple robe but in both cases these colours are immediately identifiable as being of Eastern origin and what is also important, it is conjectured that robes of these colour were worn by Dionysus and his attendants. I would like to give a slight advantage to the purple colour because Cassandra's trampling on her outer garment should be likened to Agamemnon's treading on the purple carpet (on the subject of the colours' Eastern affinities see Brooke 1962, 17) .

The Chorus will not only be baffled by Cassandra's external appearance but also by her reluctance to speak. Her silence makes her only physically present and alienates her from the other personages as Chodkowski (1978,11) remarks. Cassandra's refusal to speak has been interpreted as deliberate (so Vickers 1973, 373) because otherwise she would be trapped by Clytaemnestra's persuasiveness. However, Vickers' opinion presupposes a logical and mental procedure on her part which in my opinion is improbable because as she is influenced,

though not submerged, by the god, her self - control is considerably diminished and consequently there is not much room for cohesion, coherence and consistency. It is possible that the motif of the silent characters is not used here for the first time but it is somehow traditional (see Taplin 1977 a, 306 and Ar. Ran. 911-926) even not Aeschylean. Cassandra's silence was maybe counterbalanced by gestural signs which of course are not universally understood because they have relative value but it is important to note that she is likelier to have been motionless before she started speaking otherwise her actions would have been indicated in the text as Taplin (Taplin 1977, 130) reasonably believes.

The emerging problem is now the circumstances under which Cassandra started to deliver her prophetic message. It has been proposed (Mackail 1905, 197 and Thomson 1935, 128) that the expression of Ag. 1061 is not addressed by Clytaemnestra to Cassandra but to the Chorus and contains an admonition to drag the captive away from the chariot but as soon as the leader of the Chorus lays a hand on her the prophetess breaks out of her stupor and no further attempt is made to touch her again. From then on, the hitherto silent figure on the chariot, another function of whom is to remind us of what her master has done at Troy as Knox believes (1979, 45) and to be a living proof of the dissolved relationship of the royal couple (if of course we accept that the relationship between the King and the captive is sexual on which see Harsh 1944, 70), will start to utter her prophetic message being in a state of divine possession, the symptoms of which are more or less the same both for societies where the divine

possession is a central feature of their cult practice and for those where it is peripheral as Wilson (1967, 372) believes.

B FORM-MEANING

In the surviving tragedies of Sophocles and Euripides the question of how Greeks and Trojans communicated is avoided because it is assumed that they both speak Greek and understand each other. In Aeschylus' case the foreign origin of a character is emphasised by statements referring to foreign languages, by cacophonous imitations of foreign speech and by using foreign words (see Bacon 1961, 17, 24). In Cassandra's case others (namely the Chorus) say that Cassandra is barbarian but as for the imitations of foreign speech nothing can be said because we do not have a detailed account of how the words were pronounced. As for the foreign words only *καρβανος* can be termed with few reservations as foreign and this word is peculiarly(?) pronounced by Clytaemnestra. However, Aeschylus used other devices to convey the impression that the dramatic form of the conflict does not wholly belong to the fifth century B.C .

The poet used the third actor not to create a three-cornered confrontation but the simplest form of dialogue in drama that between actor and Chorus, which takes us back to the time of Thespis. If we bear in mind that Cassandra does not address the Chorus very often, we could even speak of a monologue which perhaps reminds us of primitive rituals and techniques. Cassandra is "obliged" after Clytaemnestra's audacious words, allegedly connected with the exclusion of Barbarians from the Eleusinia (Thomson quoted by Tierney 1937, 15), to respond in a way that presents values different from those that common people believed the barbarians shared. Moreover

Aeschylus had to make Cassandra's words seem emotionally spontaneous but at the same time not very distant from logic because the occult should come to terms with a more civilised view of the world in order to keep the balance (on this see de Romilly 1959, 81). We said something about the nature of confrontation between Cassandra and the Chorus ; perhaps it is useful to remember that an answer picking up the words of the previous speaker as happens several times during the scene is a feature of early tragic antiphony as Fraenkel (1950, 318) convincingly argues. Moreover this feature of exact responsion bringing stichomythia into its most extreme form, arises out of ritual practices in the consultation of oracles (Else 1977, 84) . According to Myres (1948, 199), stichomythia is a traditional survival of the ritual catechesis of an initiate; in Cassandra's case the two alternatives are not totally and mutually exclusive since Cassandra's words about the future are of oracular form, without implying that she is a Pythia, and at the same time her presence has an initiatory purpose as she tries to transmit her knowledge to the Chorus who are ignorant of the future. However, as she is frenzied and unable to communicate with the Chorus, her words are equally addressed to the world of the drama in general. The ritualistic aspect of Cassandra's words is reinforced if we take into account the simplicity of her syntax which may betray reduced contact with the environment and recall ritualistic procedures according to Ireland (1974, 514). Moreover the use of ionics and anacreontics could be a mark of barbarism but these metrical forms are not the privilege of Cassandra (the Chorus use them during the second stasimon). The collocation of ῥῆσις with τελευω (Ag.1296) that Cassandra uses addressing the Chorus shows

clearly that ^ερῆσις is associated with length (see Ag.916 where Agamemnon uses the verb ἐκτείνω to characterise his wife's lengthy welcome speech and immediately afterwards denounces it as befitting a barbarian and not a Greek king). The lengthy speech is an Ionian element characterising Cassandra as Michelini (1971, 536) argues. What is important with these features is their repetitive nature which recalls even in Homer's work the technique of cult songs (Webster 1958, 97).

It is very difficult to decide whether the lament of Cassandra has more Oriental than Greek features or vice versa, especially if we take the equations Oriental = god-centered as opposed to Greek = man - centered to be absolutely binding (on these see Alexiou 1974, 172). I would say that Cassandra's speech contains both elements because she is at the same time god-possessed and prophet of her own doom. Anyway, few could disagree that the language of Cassandra is allusive both in its simplest form, i.e series of unconnected epithets and /or nouns (Alexiou 1974, 185) and its more elaborate form, which comprises a series of metaphors and similes, i.e images in which an act and/or an object are passed into universal symbols .

Due to the special relationship between Cassandra and Apollo it is difficult to isolate aspects of imagery in which the god is not present either directly or indirectly. Cassandra is likened by Clytaemnestra to a swan who sang its death song (Ag.1444-1447) ; this image is related to Apollo because the swan was his servant (Fowler1967, 36). Other images which are related to Apollo are that of Scylla (Ag. 1233) whose story resembles that of the pursuit of the nightingale by Tereus (Irving 1990, 227) because in all probability Procne murdered her

children under divine influence and Cassandra is compelled to die under the same influence (Fontenrose 1948, 131). Apart from these connections one can discover a more subtle one, the power of silent web embroidered by Procne's sister, Philomela, to speak, an element which has many affinities with magical rituals (Bergren 1983, 72). Should someone want to push the connection further, one should note that the utterance of poetry or prophecy is described as "weaving" (Bergren loc.cit) and moreover should remember that Clytaemnestra will entrap Agamemnon in a bathrobe woven either by her or by her servants.

Until now we have seen that in Cassandra's visions men and women take the form of animals; it is not surprising that these images are influenced by the imagery characteristic of the oracles and perhaps the oracular language affects not only Cassandra but also other personages of the drama as Fraenkel (1950, 510) remarks. Attention should be drawn to the fact that not only men but also gods (Dionysus) are summoned in a variety of animal forms simultaneously and this is an Eastern and particularly Egyptian practice (Irving 1990, 43). It is widely known that Eastern tradition abounds with beast-fables and that the advent of sophistication marks the end of the primitive technique of shape-shifting (on this process see Eckels 1937, 37 and Greene 1943, 26). If one can discern a purpose in the imagery of Cassandra, which is sometimes inconsistent, one could say that all these mythical images express the necessity to transcend the difference, i.e the polarity, existing in nature in order to gain access to the ultimate reality as Eliade argues (Eliade 1951, 422) which the prophet attempts to experience, using whatever means available.

Another important feature of the Cassandra scene is the special role that names play. No one needs to be reminded of the sinister overtones of the name of Apollo (well-explained by Peradotto 1969, 5) and of Agamemnon which provoke the fear of the coryphaeus that Cassandra's reference to the name of the King and to his prospective death might bring the latter about. In Cassandra's mythical experience words are at the same time an index of what is happening, express the fusion of different things in nature and precipitate events (Peradotto 1969, 6) .

In the first part of my study (see pp. 17-25) I noted that some words are found only in Agamemnon. Nock (1972, 643) tries to account for the coinage of new words and provides us with three explanations not mutually exclusive, that the new words may be spontaneous and unconscious creations, and/or may represent an attempt to convey ideas which need expression and/or may be incorporated into images in the interest of stylistic emphasis or dramatic effect. In Cassandra's case all three alternatives are inclusive, the first two originated from her character, the third from the dramatist's intention of skilfully manipulating the plot.

In the beginning of my study of the form of Cassandra's speech and scene I "assumed" that Cassandra due to the dramatic convention knew Greek. If this assumption is wrong, the fact that Cassandra speaks Greek could be attributed to her abilities of "xenoglossia", related to spontaneous utterance of untaught foreign languages which is connected with the tribe's ceremonial and religious history (see May 1956, 90 and for an

interesting parallel involving maidens dedicated to Apollo see Burkert 1985, 110)

The dramatist paid considerable attention to every linguistic feature from exclamations to series of images, having primarily in mind to transmit Cassandra's bitter intimacy with the divine power of Apollo using archaic elements (on the relation between archaic and ancestral language see Dover 1987, 9-11) but always starting from the infinite possibilities which the language both as form and as content gave him.

Although I tried to treat form and meaning as separately as possible for practical purposes (which does not alter the fact that they are inseparable) I will try to incorporate in my study some elements about the special relation between Cassandra and Apollo.

5 ORIENTAL/PRIMITIVE ELEMENTS OF THE RELATION CASSANDRA-APOLLO

The link between them is of course their special relationship that of "sacred marriage", a tradition existent in Ancient Near East (Burkert 1985, 108) and perhaps transferred to Greece. From what Cassandra says about her relationship with Apollo, she did not allow the sacred marriage to happen because she withheld her favours so the god had perhaps sexually coerced her. This appears to have been a standard trait of the barbarian male in Greek writers (see Hall 1989, 126). But was Apollo's coercion successful ? The image of wrestling (*Ag.*1206 *δλλῃ ἦν παλαιστής κάρτ' ἐμοὶ πνέων χάριν*) has obvious sexual connotations and it is considered to be a prelude to intercourse (Lefkowitz 1986, 44) and not a word denoting the act which apparently did not happen. Is this exception to the rule an indication that Aeschylus disapproved the idea of "secret marriage" ? In my opinion Cassandra's withdrawal of her favours was her "fault" sealing her fate. Consequently Aeschylus did not perceive the image of the wrestling so narrowly but I think that he gave to it a more profound significance implying total submission to the will of the god. My opinion is corroborated by the occurrence of the image of wrestling between Zeus and the potential usurpers of his throne before the latter's downfall where I think that the sexual connotation is absent. However, the implications of physical pain and erotic penetration helped to establish a tradition in which prophetic possession originating from a male god involved pain which the priestess naturally resisted as Padel believes (1983, 14 but all the examples are from later sources and so their value is

considerably diminished). It is possible that Aeschylus related the divine possession with sexual coercion because mental disorders in young females were believed to have sexual causes (Lefkowitz 1981, 15). Given the close relationship between the priestess and the god, it was easy for literature to colour this relationship sexually. This process must have been older than Aeschylus although he had implicitly presented its echo. In my opinion, this means that in the time of Aeschylus or perhaps before him, moral and sexual issues were so closely connected that almost every moral mistake had sexual or at least erotic causes so it is not surprising that Cassandra's infidelity towards the god led to her doom.

Cassandra in three instances (Ag.1172, Ag.1206, Ag.1256) mentions three words *θερμόνους*, *πνέων*, *πῦρ* which relate the heat and fire with the god. It is not surprising that a divine breath, implying the notion of heat, is described as source for prophetic inspiration, a principle of primitive thought (Smith, W, 1965, 420). Moreover a considerable number of primitive traditions represent the magico-religious power as "burning" and this situation is not a monopoly of the mystics and the magicians as Eliade (²1970, 92) argues. Perhaps in less primitive societies the idea of possession became less abstract and consequently related to a specific divine agency (or agencies if we take into account the relation between Apollo and Dionysus). Perhaps it is useful to say that the conception of the divine possession as an ordeal by fire obviates the necessity for immediate execution of the god's judgment (Benz 1969, 242) which leads to Cassandra's death.

Another form of ordeal is the oath which has a double meaning because it summons the gods to pay attention to the innocence of the person who swears it but on the other hand even an unintentional perjury is punished by them. In Cassandra's case the meaning of the oath is twisted because she summons the Sun which is allegedly linked with Apollo so her innocence cannot be witnessed and on the other hand she can not commit a perjury because she is a prophet and the fate of the other personages is sealed. The invocation to the Sun is a traditional element which is attested in the inscriptions (Alexiou 1974, 179) and perhaps dates from Homer where the Sun was invoked only when a serious oath was needed according to Goodison (1989, 131). Another reason for invoking the Sun is because the location of the dead and the underworld is in the West where the sun sets and consequently the end of the sun's cycle coincides with the end of another cycle that of disasters which had befallen the House of Atreus: the House will be liberated after the acquittal of Orestes. In artistic representations of the sun dating from the early Bronze Age two features of it are emphasised, its male sex and its power of sight but both attributes are not exclusively connected with Apollo (Goodison 1989, 173-174). The oath of Cassandra to the Sun does not make good sense unless the prophetess regards the Sun as one of the primitive forces like Moira and Erinyes older than the Olympian deities, who sometimes succumb to their influence; so in this case, it is not highly possible that when Cassandra says "Sun", she definitely means "Apollo".

Enough attention has been drawn to some motifs which could be termed as Oriental and / or primitive and perhaps

it is time we viewed the figures of Cassandra and Apollo in a more comprehensive and global way.

There is no doubt that Homer knew of Cassandra but he did not consider her to be a prophetess ; she is simply the first to perceive Hector's coffin. The motif of the prophetic gift that Apollo bestowed to her is perhaps an invention of the writers of the Epic Cycle (Davreux 1942, 92). If the name Alexandra is an attempt at Hellenisation, then we should think her name as foreign. It is useful to remember that the other name of Paris is Alexandros, an element having considerable bearing on my conjecture about the origin of Cassandra's name. Davreux (1942, 25) insists that Cassandra in Aeschylus is modelled on the Pythia but in my opinion she is likelier to resemble a Sibyl whose presence dates from the eighth and seventh centuries B.C. (Rohde⁸ 1924, 293). In Cassandra's personality the divine and the human element coexist and the latter manifests itself in two cases when she denied her favours to the god and when she trampled on the god's insignia so if the god was responsible in a manner for her first transgression, he had nothing to do with the second as Adam (1908, 147) rightly argues. I have said that Cassandra's transition from an intuitive woman to a prophetess was accomplished by the appropriation of Helenos' identity. However, the tradition had its own way of describing the process because according to a tale (see Halliday 1913, 70), snakes licked the ears of the babies, Cassandra and Helenos, and endowed them with the gift of prophecy. Perhaps this tradition dates from the days when Cassandra's tragic fate in the aftermath of the war was conceived because where snakes appear in negative role in relation to

prophecy, they also impart the gift of prophecy (Goodison 1989, 187).

A further step from prophetic inspiration is divine possession. There is no doubt that the tradition Aeschylus had in mind was rich because the motif of possession is traditional if not primitive as it implies contact with ancestral spirits (another possible explanation for the invocation to the Sun and the reference to the Erinyes) thus becoming the basis for the exercise of the divinely-inspired prophecy, an extremely primitive belief as Lewis (Lewis 1978, 147) argues.

Some scholars advanced the opinion that Cassandra is both a victim and a Fury i.e. a figure like Erinyes (O'Brien -Moore 1924, 86) but even if we accept this theory (which is hardly plausible since the Erinyes protect Dike whereas Cassandra violated it) we still have to face the same problem because we can account neither for the divine possession nor for the oracular aspect of Cassandra's words by a simple reference to the Erinyes. If we obstinately want to find connections between Cassandra and the other characters of the trilogy a kind of connection can be established between Clytaemnestra and Agamemnon on one side and Cassandra on the other because all three are at the same time retributors and victims according to Schein (1982, 15) although I cannot totally agree with him on the retributory force of Cassandra.

There is no doubt that the Apollo of the two plays is different from the Apollo of the third. In Agamemnon and especially in Choephoroi his grace is a blessing in disguise (Poliakoff 1980, 256) because the god is not only two-faced but also betrays his nature i.e. the god foreign to lamentation reveals

lamentable evils for Cassandra, the Olympian and healer predicts pursuing Erinyes and the pure one decrees matricide which pollutes the doer (see Roberts 1984, 84, according to whom his ambiguity is perhaps due to the fact that he is an oracular god identifiable with whatever comes to be). In my opinion there is much more than this : Apollo's portrayal is inscribed to Aeschylus' plan to mark the transition from the eternally shifting figures of primitive thought (even Cassandra, who deserves the least to suffer, has ambivalent feelings towards Apollo, exaltation and repulsion see Dodds 1944, 165 and Bérnard 1985, 93-94) to the more civilised figures who emerge from the end of Eumenides.

Cassandra comes with Agamemnon to Argos and like Darius (on this connection see Moreau 1985, 112 n.35) delivers a prophetic message which cannot alter the course of the play because the Chorus cannot believe her completely. The riddles that she insists on using, her one-sided arguments and her manipulation of the audience (on these general traits of communication see O' Keefe 1990, 160, 161) make her message hardly credible although a compromise is reached : the Chorus refuse to listen to Agamemnon's death.

From the whole analysis I think it has been shown that Aeschylus charged the Cassandra scene with Oriental and primitive elements. We have no way of positively knowing what he considered to be primitive and /or Oriental. However two points should be borne in mind : first that Aeschylus regarded the word "barbarian" as denoting attitudes rather than people and in second place some of the barbaric and primitive elements were used as an expression of emotional and social disorder (see Irving 1990, 15) cured by the advent of a relatively new order in

Eumenides where all contradictions were vanished after the successful cooperation of the Olympian gods, the primitive forces (Erinyes) and some personages of the drama.

PART III . AGAMEMNON AND CASSANDRA

It would not be an exaggeration if one expressed the opinion that all Agamemnon is about is the justice of Zeus and the consequent necessity for retribution. The notion of justice presupposes that of sin which antedates the punishment.

Although Aeschylus deals with the crimes of the present, he views the "career" of the sinner more globally by doing constant retrospections to deeds enacted before and not necessarily by the same agent. The narration of the past blends with the action and despite the typical distinction between present and past these two fractions of time are meticulously interwoven.

The establishment of bonds between past and present should be done in such a way that the dramatic impact would not be minimised but at the same time it would not be blatantly demonstrated. Aeschylus solved this problem by employing a technique which might be termed as "contradictory portrayal" of a character. The hero/ heroine is set in unfavourable or favourable light and his/her presentation is continuously changing until the true nature of the character is revealed (see on this Herington 1986, 112). As far as Agamemnon and Clytaemnestra are concerned, they change from punishers to criminals throughout the play as Porter argues (1971, 475). This process of change is achieved by hints, the latter being expressed through repetition of some words recalling the principle of oral composition (on this principle see Havelock 1978, 294) .

Timelessness, contradictory portrayal and gradual change partially point to events prior to those enacted in the drama which are presented either in dialogue and/ or in lyric reflection providing the stimuli for the deeds performed during

the play (Rosenmeyer 1982, 225). Having dealt with the relation between Cassandra and Apollo, I shall now concentrate on Agamemnon's previous deeds without leaving out Cassandra where necessary.

However, before I start this account, I would like to refer to two events, one of real and the other of symbolic value which in my opinion have a considerable bearing on the discussion of Agamemnon's behaviour and perhaps of Cassandra: the curse of Thyestes on Atreus (whether or not there is a curse on Priam's household working on Cassandra is debatable) and the portent of eagles just before the sacrifice of Iphigeneia.

It is commonly believed that the first reference to the curse of the house of Atreus is made by Cassandra (Ag.1217-1225). This may be the case but in my opinion the curse is hinted long before this scene. Since Aeschylus does not make any reference to any personal error of Agamemnon before the sacrifice of Iphigeneia, it is quite legitimate to interpret any dark hint provided by the text in terms of the familial curse. Before the sacrifice of Iphigeneia we have its veiled announcement by the seer Calchas whose stature makes his words more authoritative. Interpreting the portent of eagles, he concludes his speech (Ag.154-155) .." *μίμνει γὰρ φοβερά παλίνορτος/ οἰκονόμος δόλῃα, μνάμων Μῆνις τεκνόποινος*". The following elements are noteworthy : the causal relation expressed by *γὰρ* between the sacrifice and the statement, the use of *μίμνει* implying that the *μῆνις* existed before, the use of *παλίνορτος* (risen again) which would be redundant if it did not refer to something that had risen before and the use of *μνάμων*. The fact that the *μῆνις* was *μνάμων* implies that it existed before and this view is corroborated by the use of

τεκνόποινος which refers to Iphigeneia and alludes to the children of Thyestes. The same ambivalent meaning is perhaps present in the expression παρακοπά πρωτοπήμων (Ag.223). From the above, we could say that the sacrifice of Iphigeneia but not the war was partially (not wholly as Kitto 1956, 30 believes) motivated by the curse of the house of Atreus. These references to the curse will become more explicit much later in the Cassandra scene where it will be revealed that the curse was widely known and duly appreciated. There Cassandra refers in veiled terms to the monstrous act of Thyestes, who unknowingly devoured the limbs of his own children (Ag.1095-1097) and then to the new slaughter (Ag. 1100-1104). The Chorus reply to both statements (Ag.1105-1106) τούτων αἰδρὲς εἰμι τῶν μαντευμάτων, ἐκεῖνα δ' ἔγνων· πᾶσα γὰρ ἡ πόλις βοᾷ. There is no doubt that τούτων refers to the new disasters while ἐκεῖνα to the Thyestian banquet; attention should be paid to the metaphor πόλις βοᾷ. It should be borne in mind that the curse is known from the beginning and plays a significant role, though not the only one, in what will happen later. Attempts were made (some of them by Lebeck 1971, 36, Lloyd-Jones 1962, 197, 1979, 69) to explain every decision of Agamemnon in terms of the curse but in my opinion they will not have much success if they do not perceive the character of the King more globally. I will deal with the motives for Agamemnon's deeds on a case by case basis when I later treat his crucial decisions.

If the existence of the ancestral curse of the house of Atreus is more or less obvious, this is not the case for the curse on Priam's household. The situation on this point is rather complicated. Leahy (1974, 18) has contended that when Paris committed his crime he was under the influence of Peitho

engendered by the hybristic attitude of Troy (and possibly by his infatuation for Helen since Peitho is sometimes perceived as an attendant of Aphrodite) but there is no textual evidence to support this view and even if we accept it, it is very difficult to find evidence in the text suggesting that Helen was convinced by Paris to follow him to Troy against her better judgment; on the contrary she is set in an unfavourable light throughout the play. However, I cannot refrain from mentioning some hints that might suggest that the crime of Paris was only an element in a sequence of crimes. The Chorus after having said that Zeus and Night spreaded over Troy a big net, continued their contemplation as follows (Ag. 361-366) *Δία τοι ξένιον μέγαν αἰδοῦμαι τὸν τάδε πράξαντ', / ἐπ' Ἀλεξάνδρῳ τείνοντα πάλαι τόξον, ὅπως ἄν' μήτε πρὸ καιροῦ μήθ' ὑπὲρ ἄστρον βέλος ἥλιθιον σκήψειεν.* The problem that arises is the length of time referred to by *πάλαι*. Is it after the commission of the deed or before, making a reference to earlier crimes justified? In my opinion the former happens (I would even suggest that it happens simultaneously with the deed note the expression *μήτε πρὸ καιροῦ μήθ' ὑπὲρ ἄστρον*) because of the meaning of the *ὅπως* clause. This opinion is corroborated by a later overt reference to the Trojans' attitude towards the guilty couple (Ag. 700-708) where it is said that the Trojans celebrated the wedding of Paris and is implied that the guilt of Paris became communal as Fraenkel (1950, 336) believes and respect has been disregarded (Ag. 700-701) *Ἰλίῳ δὲ κῆδος ὀρθώνυμον τελεσσίφρωνι μῆνις ἤλασεν...* My conclusion is that the ancestral guilt of Priamids is not based on solid textual evidence while that of Agamemnon is adequately illustrated.

Before treating the crucial decisions of

Agamemnon it is in my opinion necessary to refer to the portent of the eagles because numerous motifs which will be treated later are contained in germ in this portent, the meaning of which has provoked fierce arguments among scholars. The parodos starts by establishing a connection between Agamemnon and Menelaus on one hand and the eagles on the other, which, deprived of their young, circle round their nests raising a battle cry (Ag. 40-54). Who removed the young is unknown but is not crucial because the poet had already conveyed the impression of the fierce temper of the Atreidai. Their cry is heard by either Apollo, Pan or Zeus who sent to the transgressor the Erinyes after the commission of the deed (Ag. 59) *ὑστερόποινον πέμπει παραβάσιν Ἑρινύν* (note the emphatic use of the adjective). Later (Ag. 60-63) the connection between the Atreidai and Paris is established in plain words and what is more important it is said that Zeus has decreed for both Greeks and Trojans the same (Ag. 66-67) *..θήσω Δαναοῖσιν Τρώσιν θ' ὁμόλως..*. The opposition to the war becomes more obvious in the next phrase (Ag. 67-68) *..ἔστι δ' ὅπηι νῦν/ ἔστι,.....*, a form of *pankoinon* which is used to avoid discussion. In the second part of the omen two eagles (no doubt the Atreidai) are openly (note [Ag. 117] *παμπρέμπτοις ἐν ἔδραισιν*) committing the crime i.e are feeding on one pregnant hare. This deed does not correspond to any natural order because nowhere in nature are two eagles fed on one animal (Fraenkel 1950, 96). What was more impious was that the hare was pregnant. The eagles -Atreidai applied for the first time in the play the law of punishment since they were meant to be the protectors of justice. The oracle is explained by the seer Calchas who says that Troy will be sacked and prays so

that the victory will not be stained, explaining the cause of his caution (Ag. 134-138) " ..οἷκ<τ>ωι γὰρ ἐπίφθονος Ἄρτεμις ἀγνὰ / πτανοῖσιν κυσὶ πατρὸς/ αὐτότοκον πρὸ λόχου μογεράν πτάκα θυομένοισιν,/ στυγεῖ δὲ δεῖπνον αἰετῶν " and later he says that Artemis is the mistress of the young of the animals. Despite this clear indication about the discord between Artemis and Zeus there are scholars who either still believe that the cause of Artemis' wrath are the crimes that Agamemnon will commit at Troy (Smith, M, 1980, 33, Belfiore 1983,11 and Smith, O 1973, 6) or that there is no discord between Artemis and Zeus (Lawrence 1976, 110). The first part of the portent was clear : the evil-doers are punished after the crimes. If this did not happen, then the whole play would be reduced to a mere display of the crudest determinism leaving no room for free choice. In my opinion there is little doubt that what Artemis loathes is the killing of a pregnant animal by predatory ones (Peradotto 1969 a, 256). From this moment on, Artemis works independently from Zeus and decides to punish Agamemnon. A disordered universe could not be depicted in a better way and Agamemnon is caught up in the conflict between Zeus and Artemis (Goldhill 1984, 26). Artemis, who is perhaps too weak to confront Zeus directly, chooses to impose a conditional punishment on Agamemnon : just as the eagles killed the children of the hare, Agamemnon will have to sacrifice his own daughter if he wants to pursue his aim to conquer Troy. Calchas foreknows what will happen and tries to summon Apollo as an ally (Ag. 146) *ἡΐον δὴ καλέω Παιῶνα.* (on the attribution of the cult title Paian to Apollo and Asclepius see Craik 1980, 180). However, Agamemnon has to take the bitter decision; the time for personal choice has come .

The perverted murder of the pregnant hare will be followed by another hideous crime on the human level this time. The text will be again our constant companion. What strikes the reader immediately is that the sacrifice of Iphigeneia and its agent are not explicitly stated but both are hinted. After the Hymn to Zeus, the closing lines of which are abundant with forebodings : (Ag. 180-181) ...*μνησιπήμων πόνος· καὶ παρ' ἄλκοντας ἦλθε σωφρονεῖν* the idea of a future atrocious crime becomes more and more clear. Agamemnon did not blame any prophet (of course Calchas is hinted) for the interpretation of the portent but he was (Ag.187) *ἐμπαίοις τύχαισι συμπνέων*. Two elements are worthy of our attention in this sentence, the meaning of *ἐμπαίοις* =bursting sudden (see L.S.J.⁹ s.v.) and the use of *συμπνέων*. Agamemnon has been linked with the wind that blows together with that sent by Artemis ; the motif of double motivation appears here for the first time.

After this dark hint a detailed description of the effects of the wind still follows in order to convey the impression of an impasse, which necessitates painful solutions, announced in veiled terms by the seer (Ag.199-204) *χείματος ἄλλο μῆχαρ / βριθύτερον πρόμοισιν / μάντις ἔκλαγξεν, / προφέρων Ἄρτεμιν, ὥστε χθόνα βάκτροις / ἐπικρούσαντας Ἀτρείδας δάκρυ μὴ κατασχεῖν*. Why did the Atreidai cry? Why did the seer propose a *βριθύτερον* remedy and lastly why is Artemis the cause? The last question was answered during the discussion of the eagle portent but I should note here the presence of *ἔκλαγξεν* which unmistakably points to the beginning of the narration of the eagle portent (Ag. 47). The connection is apparent and the context is not extremely different

because a hideous crime was about to take place as well, the feeding of the eagles on the pregnant hare.

As I have said, the text does not provide us with explicit reference that Artemis had ordained the crime, Iphigeneia should be the victim and Agamemnon should sacrifice his daughter. In my opinion there is little doubt that the sacrifice was conditioned : if Agamemnon wants to pursue the expedition, he has to sacrifice his own daughter which means that Agamemnon has theoretically two options. As far as the reasons for Artemis' wrath are concerned they should be traced to her animosity towards Zeus as the eagle portent has clearly shown and not to any invidious feelings she has for Agamemnon, who had not done something which could incur Artemis' wrath (see Denniston-Page 1957, xxiii) (the motif of ancestral curse cannot be considered to be Agamemnon's fault). The perversion of the eagle's crime against the pregnant hare will be matched with another perverted crime : a father will have to sacrifice his own daughter, without being morally tainted, in order to punish the deed of Paris, on the impious nature of which the poet leaves no doubt (on the motif of perversion see Bollack and De la Combe 1981, cxxii). All that remains to be seen is the answer of the king who is bound to respond because he cannot avoid the decision unless he refrains from being an agent (on the "double bind" decisions see Lemmon 1962, 151) which in this case means that he will have to step down from the leadership of the Greek army. Before the Chorus' reporting the words of Agamemnon we should bear in mind that Agamemnon and Menelaus could not help crying when Calchas talked about the heavier "remedy".

The King's speech can be divided into two questions and two statements. The first question is about the two alternatives that he has. He cites as his first the obedience to the goddess' demand to sacrifice his own daughter and then ponders extensively about the second in emotionally charged terms : *δόμων ἄγαλμα* (Ag.208) and (Ag.209-210) *παρθενοσφάγοισιν ῥείθροις*. We should also note that he takes particular care not to stain his own hands with the blood of his virgin daughter but realises the impasse (Ag. 211) *τί τῶνδ' ἄνευ κακῶν* ; The second question is about his duty to the army and to the alliance (Ag. 212-213) *πῶς λιπόνους γένωμαι / ξυμμαχίας ἀμαρτῶν*;

This last (perhaps rhetorical) question decides the issue because Agamemnon with his silent refusal to abandon the leadership of the expedition has two arguments in favour of the sacrifice, i.e. his duty towards Artemis and that towards his fellow commanders. Lawrence (1976, 105) wondered why Agamemnon did not plead the word of Zeus. The answer in my opinion is that he does not know that he is the agent of Zeus. The god did not force him to go to Troy but endorsed his will to do so. This opinion is corroborated by the absence of reference to any particular god when the King is back from Troy (Ag. 810-811) *πρῶτον μὲν Ἄργος καὶ θεοὺς ἐγχωρῖους / δίκη προσειπεῖν..*

The last two statements of Agamemnon reveal his change of heart from desperation in front of the two alternatives to resolution to perform the deed which has now become exonerated (Ag. 214-217) *παυσανέμου γὰρ / θυσίας παρθενίου θ' αἵματος ὀργαῖ / περιόργως ἀπὸ δ' αὐδαῖ / θέμις. εὖ γὰρ εἶη*. (we should note the existence of *ἀπὸ δ' αὐδαῖ θέμις*). As for the second

sentence, there is not much to comment on because its blasphemous nature is apparent (see on this Hammond 1965, 47).

The Chorus could not describe better the violent change of heart of Agamemnon; what he previously abhorred, he is now determined to do although partially compelled by the goddess (thus Lesky 1966, 82 and Nussbaum 1986, 48). From that time on, Agamemnon lost every scruple and in the words of the Chorus (Ag. 221) *τὸ παντότολμον φρονεῖν μετέγνων*. The Chorus' closing remarks before the completion of the ugly deed are (Ag. 223-227) *..ἔτλα δ' οὖν / θυτῆρ γενέσθαι / θυγατρός, γυναικοποιῶν / πολέμων ἄρωγάν / καὶ προτέλεια ναῶν*. The King is explicitly rebuked for the sacrifice of his daughter to promote a war for a wanton woman. Something which might escape attention is the use of the verb *ἔτλα*. Placed at the beginning of the sentence with obvious emphatic purpose it is also used to unify the fate and the deeds of the protagonists of the drama as it will be used for Helen (Ag. 408), for Cassandra (uttered by herself Ag. 1289) and for Clytaemnestra (Ag. 1542). Moreover the word in Ag. 1289 conveys a positive impression about Cassandra whereas in the two other cases the impression is unfavourable. The affinity between Agamemnon's deeds and Cassandra's pathos will be extended to the narration of the sacrifice of Iphigeneia. Agamemnon ordered to close Iphigeneia's mouth so as not to utter a curse but she tried to catch attention by a wordless glance. Cassandra will be the centre of attention after the departure of the King because of her silence. Moreover Iphigeneia (Ag. 239) *κρόκου βαφὰς δ' εἰς πέδον χέουσα* and Cassandra says (Ag. 1172) *ἐγὼ δὲ θερμόνους τάχ' ἐν πέδῳ βαλῶ*. The act of Iphigeneia's disrobing can be paralleled to Cassandra's defilement of her prophetic attire (see Zeitlin 1965,

470, Griffith 1988, 553). Last but not least we have to mention that perhaps the reason for Iphigeneia's disrobing was that the veil was dislodged by the bridle (see Cunningham 1984,10) (cf. Clytaemnestra's words about Cassandra [Ag.1066-1067] *..χαλινὸν δ' οὐκ ἐπίσταται φέρειν / πρὶν αἵματηρόν ἑξαφρίζεσθαι μένος*). The juxtaposition of the fate of these two victims joined by their relation to Agamemnon will become apparent much later in the Cassandra scene. If the opinion of Hall (1989, 144) that child sacrifice was a Phoenician custom is sustained, then it is possible that Agamemnon committed not only an impious act but also a barbarian one, for the depiction of which the Oriental painting might have been a source of inspiration for the poet as Goldman (1910, 116) believes.

From the above analysis it has become clear, I think, that Agamemnon's behaviour at Aulis cannot be attributed to either divine intervention or personal choice but to both factors although I cannot refrain from acknowledging that the element of personal choice was stronger because Artemis' demand was conditional. The comment of Chorus leaves little or no doubt that the felix culpa committed by Agamemnon will be a springboard for other atrocious deeds. The King has faltered at Aulis and his only excuse could be the goddess' demand ; later in the carpet scene, he will falter again without being able to have recourse to the same excuse.

Another occasion when crimes could be committed by Agamemnon will be of course the Trojan war. It has been noted from the beginning of the parodos that the Chorus said that Zeus had decreed the same for the Argives and the Trojans and the fault of Agamemnon makes this statement all the

more sustained. The next reference to the Trojan war will be the lengthy account by Clytaemnestra of the first moments after the siege of Troy and no one could contend that the Greek army is portrayed very favourably ; on the contrary a lot of time is spent on the woes of Trojans and then on the fate of Greeks. At the beginning the tone is favourable but later is changed (Ag.338-340) *εἰ δ' εὐσεβοῦσι τοῖς πολισσοῦχοις θεοὺς / τοῖς τῆς ἀλόουσης γῆς θεῶν θ' ἰδρύματα, / οὐ τὰν ἐλόντες αὐτοῖς ἀνθαλοῖεν ἄν* (it is noticeable that the conditional clause is expressing a real event). I do not believe that Clytaemnestra could be a reliable witness of what happened after the sack of Troy (unless we credit her with clairvoyant abilities) but here again a narration favourable for the Greeks is interrupted by gloomy hints. The Queen does not want the gods to punish Agamemnon for his transgression as she wants to save this duty for herself and the conditional clause intends to credit Agamemnon as the leader of the army with more transgressions. In the first stasimon the Chorus focus their criticism on Paris who had kicked down the altar of Justice (Ag. 381-384) and on Helen for whom a lot of soldiers will die. Nowhere in the text and in the whole play can we find an undoubtedly favourable reference to the war (Leahy 1974, 17). When the Chorus sing of the dead soldiers the rebuke to the Atreidai is raised loud and clear (Ag.450-451) *φθονερόν δ' ὑπ' ἄλγος ἔρπει/ προδίκους Ἀτρείδαις* and then the attack becomes more personal (Ag. 472-474) *μήτ' εἶην πτολιπόρθης, / μήτ' οὖν αὐτὸς ἀλοὺς ὑπ' ἄλ-λων βίον κατίδοιμι*. If we compare this passage, especially its first part with (Ag. 783) *ἄγε δὴ βασιλεῦ, Τροίας π<τ>ολίπορθ'* then the connection becomes apparent (the second part of the phrase is

perhaps a hint at Agamemnon's prospective death but one should not overstress this matter).

The arrival of the herald gives to our inquiry a new twist as he and the King are the most reliable witness and he will be proved as such in his simplicity as he gives an evocative portrayal of the destruction of Troy grimly confirming Clytaemnestra's narration and, what is more, unwillingly incriminating Agamemnon since he attributes the ravage of Troy to the King in cooperation with Zeus. He concludes his brief first narration with a striking sentence (Ag. 537) διπλᾷ δ' ἔτεισαν Πριαμίδαι θάμάρτια. Zeus endorsed the decision of Atreidai i.e. to punish Paris, but in no way did he order them to make the whole household of Priam pay the double price for Paris' deeds. In his second narration about the hardships of Greeks before they sacked Troy, he wants to finish with the issue (Ag. 567) of speaking about Menelaus' whereabouts. Menelaus was missing after a storm near Thrace which destroyed the Greek fleet, a disaster for which, according to the herald, the gods are responsible. From these words it is natural to infer that the deeds of Greeks at Troy were not beyond any reproach and that is why the herald is trying to close the subject with the usual retort that everything may go well.

The Chorus during the next stasimon will focus their attention on Helen and Paris. The lion cub parable which dominates the second stasimon is about Helen on the surface but includes Agamemnon as well because he will be called by Cassandra as lion (Ag.1259) (see Knox 1979, 30). My opinion is different from Knox's because saying again that some god (Ag.735) sent Agamemnon as retributor adds nothing to our

understanding of the play but saying that Clytaemnestra was nurtured by some god to be an avenger is something important. As for the difficulty with the "lion" it is easily overcome since Clytaemnestra was identified with a lioness by Cassandra (Ag. 1258). However, after this hint at Clytaemnestra the text abounds with references to a new hybris (definitely that taking place in the carpet scene) and its exact punishment (Ag. 755-756, Ag. 758-760, Ag. 764-765).

The Chorus will later welcome the triumphant King on the chariot (on the change of its significance see Détienné 1968, 318) and warn him of the atmosphere of false joy and marital happiness but without forgetting to mention one of their complaints against him, the war for the sake of a woman (Ag. 799-800). They end their welcome speech as follows (Ag. 807-809) *γνώσῃ δὲ χρόνῳ διαπενθόμενος / τὸν τε δικάως καὶ τὸν ἀκαίρως / πόλιν οἰκουροῦντα πολιτῶν*, a hint for Clytaemnestra's treacherous role but for the King, during the carpet scene, there is no room for knowledge, only for persuasion.

When Agamemnon enters the orchestra, he is a dramatic character credited with serious mistakes : the war for the sake of a wanton woman the sacrifice of Iphigeneia and his overzealous attitude at Troy which resulted in a considerable loss of human lives and in the impious destruction of the temples of the gods. The King starts his speech by thanking the gods for their support and although he uses almost exclusively past tenses, he says (Ag. 819-820) *Ἄτῃς θύελλαι ζῶσι· συνθήσκουσα δέ / σποδὸς προπέμπει πύονας πλούτου πνοάς*. One can not refrain from considering these lines to be ambivalent applying both to Priam and to Agamemnon. A chieftain would normally refrain from

referring to such a war as a result for Helen's kidnap ; but not Agamemnon who also mentions the gruesome details of the siege of Troy with the cunning ploy of the wooden horse. So from the first moments of his appearance Agamemnon shocks the audience by being the exact opposite of the heroic ideal, which the spectators expected him to fulfil (Verrall 1889, 108 limits this opinion to the dialogue between the King and the Queen). That Agamemnon is obsessed by his deeds at Troy, is confirmed by his interpretation of the Chorus' warning about his wife. Although he claims that he grasps completely its meaning (note his tricolon in Ag.830-831), he can not shift his mind from his martial deeds and focus on the situation in his family (on the meaning of the Chorus' warning see Bollack and de la Combe 1981, cxi).

In reply the Queen will deliver a speech abundant with pompous statements about her love for Agamemnon which makes apparent how deep is the hatred she has for him but Agamemnon did not understand the hidden meaning of her words. He simply stated his opposition to trample on the purple carpets to reach the door of the palace because this action is more suitable to barbarians and provokes the wrath of the gods because the tapestries are reserved for them (Lloyd-Jones 1979, 65) and for their statues (Mazon ²1935, 42).

So Agamemnon should by dramatic necessity (Dawe 1963, 50 makes too much of its importance) reach the door of the palace and enter which makes the carpet scene a symbolic trifle (see Alexanderson 1969, 16) ; why it is so will be explained later. Clytaemnestra's stand in the brief stichomythia (its extent shows how easily Agamemnon is convinced) is based on refuting the other side's arguments in a way that is more sentimentally

than logically appealing since the King is an easy prey for her as his retorts constantly repeat his intention of not incurring the divine wrath. His two sentences (Ag. 940) οὗτοι γυναικὸς ἐστὶν ἡμίρειν μάχης and (Ag. 942) ἧ καὶ σὺ νίκην τῆσδ' ἀήριος τίεις; prove in the most obvious manner his defeat. The words of Clytaemnestra (Ag. 943) summarise the situation πιθοῦ · κρατεῖς μέντοι, παρείς γ' ἐκῶν ἐμοί. The king is first convinced and then performs the impious deed, explicitly acknowledged by his statement in (Ag. 957) εἴμ' εἰς δόμων μέλαθρα πορφύρας πατῶν.

There is a connection between his deeds at Aulis and at Argos since the movement is the same : opposition to the deed but later deliberate performance of it. If the sacrifice of Iphigeneia could be attributed to partial divine intervention, the divine compulsion is totally absent in the carpet scene; on the contrary, the King who sacrificed his daughter to placate Artemis will perform an impious deed to glorify himself (the fact that he has his shoes removed is not considered to be extremely extenuating). It is inevitable to conclude that the red carpet symbolises all the blood spilled before the appearance of the King. (Lebeck 1971, 86 traces this motif back to the ancestral curse which is in my opinion far -fetched).

The new hybris is symbolically engendered by the old ones (see Hogan 1984, 77 and Conacher 1987, 38).

Agamemnon achieved what he tried to avoid : he did not want to provoke the wrath of the gods but he did; he wanted to die in happiness but he will not ; he did not want to look like a barbarian but his impious deed makes him look like one. In the first stasimon the Chorus singing about Paris, say (Ag. 369-372) ..οὐκ ἔφα τις θεοῦς βροτῶν ἀξιοῦσθαι μέλειν / ὅσοις ἀθίκτων χάρις πατοῖθ' ..

i.e divine punishment is exacted for those who trample on what they should not. In the carpet scene Agamemnon admitted that Priam would trample on the red carpets so the hero condemns himself in his own words and makes his act seem as an adherence to barbarian and oriental luxury (thus Zeitlin 1978, 184, Post 1951, 87) (for those interested in the affinities between art and literature, suffice it to say that the image of trampling was perhaps borrowed from the oriental art).

Before Agamemnon steps on the carpets, he admonishes Clytaemnestra to treat Cassandra well because (Ag. 951) *..τὸν κρατοῦντα μαλακῶς / θεὸς πρόσωθεν εὐμενῶς προσδέσκεται*. It is doubtful whether the King is motivated by his feelings for Cassandra or he mentions her to placate the gods just as he sacrificed Iphigeneia for the same purpose. Anyway, nothing in his language betrays an erotic relationship between him and Cassandra; moreover he says that Cassandra has been accorded to him by the army for the victory at Troy which means that he tries to justify her presence as an involuntary mistake (see Earp 1950, 55).

If she is his concubine, as it was the practice of the fifth century B.C., then her presence represents a threat to the Queen's status and to her place in the house in the long run (on the role of concubines as potential mothers see Arthur 1984, 17). Meridor (1987, 41) argues that this request of Agamemnon reveals his personal relation to her. For me the King's admonition to treat Cassandra right might be a careful hypocritical tactic to diminish the impact of his impious action but still I cannot give a definite opinion on whether or not they had a relationship different from that between a master and a slave. However, the

role of Agamemnon as far as Cassandra is concerned is in the core of some other versions of the story (see Grimal 1986, 91, s.v. Cassandra) most of which are later than the Oresteia.

Before the start of the Cassandra scene, the Queen tries to convince her to enter the palace but she has to retreat as the captive does not seem to communicate with the environment so Clytaemnestra leaves the scene disgraced. The use of *ἀτιμασθήσομαι* (Ag. 1068) is peculiar since it is uttered by a woman like Clytaemnestra. Is she dishonoured because Cassandra does not reply or because she is the concubine of Agamemnon or because of both?

In the Cassandra scene Agamemnon is set in a favourable light, perhaps the most favourable of all personages. A good illustration of this is (Ag. 1223-1227) *ἐκ τῶνδε ποινὰς φημι βουλεύειν τινά, / ... τῶι μολόντι δεσπότῃ· {ἐμῷ φέρειν γὰρ χρὴ τὸν δούλιον ζυγόν} / ναῶν τ' ἄπαρχος Ἰλίου τ' ἀναστάτης*. Are these the words of a captive woman whose master is responsible for the utter destruction of her city? Certainly not. Before Cassandra defiles her attire, she says (Ag. 1262-1263) *ἐπεύχεται*, (sc. Clytaemnestra) *θήγουσα φωτὶ φάσγανον, / ἐμῆς ἀγωγῆς ἀντιτελῆσθαι φόνον*. The last line points, I think, to the opinion that Cassandra and Agamemnon were enjoying a special relationship.

Immediately afterwards Cassandra will destroy the god's insignia and will step over her official robe just as Agamemnon stepped over a long carpet to enter into the palace. Cassandra is doing the same on a smaller scale (Taplin 1977 a, 321 believes that she will make the journey on the ground which is partially true). However, the fundamental difference is that she will meet her death knowingly unlike her master whose fate is

joint to hers (Ag. 1313-1314) ἀλλ' εἴμι κὰν δόμοισι κωκύουσ' ἐμήν / Ἀγαμέμνονός τε μοῖραν.. If they did not enjoy a special relation why would she bewail his fate too? Their difference in ethical stature is perhaps signalled by the fact that Agamemnon died violently but Cassandra probably died as she wished (Ag.1293 ...ἀσφάδαιστος.. is contrasted to Ag.1384 ..κὰν δυοῖν οἰμωγμάτων).

Cassandra and Agamemnon were joined in life (the idea of concubinage becomes more and more clear) and in death not only by the words and deeds of both but also by what the agent of the crime has to say after the completion of the deed. Cassandra's role from prominent in her scene has become subordinated to the necessity to murder Agamemnon. The Chorus predict the consequences of the crime but Clytaemnestra, familiar with arguments based on analogy, tries to justify her case arguing against her husband's and putting forward as justification of the regicide, the sacrifice of Iphigeneia and the erotic relationship of Cassandra with Agamemnon thus stressing the paradox of Cassandra's situation : at the same time she is prophetess and captive, priestess and bedfellow of the King (a rather subtle hint is her phrase *Χρῶσιδων μείλιγμα* [Ag.1439] recalling the plague Apollo sent because Agamemnon did not want to give back Chryseis to her father; the same god will now punish his priestess for a crime against him)

From Cassandra's place in Clytaemnestra's argumentation and from the words with which the Queen closes her brief reference to her (Ag.1446-1447) ..έμοι δ' ἐπήγαγεν / +εὐνής+ παροψώνημα τῆς ἐμῆς χλιδῆς we can infer that Clytaemnestra views the crime against Cassandra as of secondary importance. It is noteworthy that both the verb *τρίβω* (ιστοτριβῆς [Ag.1443]) and

παροψωνεῖν (*παροψώνημα* [Ag. 1447]) belong to the language of comedy but are very rare in tragedy (on the influence of Old Comedy on Aeschylus see Herington 1963). In my opinion, it is not surprising that Clytaemnestra gives to Cassandra's murder comical dimensions as her blasphemous and impious attitude has become apparent at least from her narration of the violent death of Agamemnon: blasphemy there, ridicule here and no inconsistency of course. The queen will keep on mentioning Agamemnon's murder but references or allusions to Cassandra will not appear any more.

The tableau of murders taking place in the first play is completed : Agamemnon died because he obeyed the goddess (sacrifice of Iphigeneia) and later because he defied the gods (behaviour at Troy, carpet scene). Cassandra had the same fate because she went back on her promise to Apollo but died with her eyes wide open and not blind-folded like her master. Her presence on stage endowed her with a true insight of the human condition bewildering to the Chorus. If the maxim *πάθει, μάθος* (Ag.177) has any recipient in the play, this should be Cassandra because although she knows her death and its cause from the beginning, at the end of her scene she transcends her own situation and ponders on the precariousness of the human condition (see on that Stanford 1983, 27) thus illustrating in the best possible way that the subject of tragedy is the *καθόλου* (Arist. *Poet.* 1450 b 12, *Poet.* 1451 b 7, 8, *Poet.* 1455 b1).

It is difficult to see in Agamemnon's personal tragedy, let alone in Cassandra's, how divine intervention shapes the action absolutely. In Aulis the dilemma was conditional, in the carpet scene divine intervention is almost non-existent as is

the case for Agamemnon's behaviour at Troy. As for Cassandra she blatantly deceived the god, defying a widely applicable custom (Ag.1207). If she is favourably portrayed it is not because she had not sinned but because she had sinned less than Agamemnon and Clytaemnestra.

If the element of divine intervention is not preponderant, then one should wonder about the role of the gods. We could say that the gods in this play are more principles than visible personages with concrete characterisation and they oppose impious deeds not because they are harmful for themselves but because they disrupt the balance of the universe. The two main characteristics of gods as agents of justice are that they safeguard the balance of the universe and they punish any sort of transgression (see Bollack and de la Combe 1981, 208). However, their justice in Agamemnon does not take into account the human weakness and the extenuating circumstances (on the criminal law of archaic society see Dodds 1960, 35) and in this respect one could agree with Lloyd-Jones (1962, 187) that the justice of Zeus has more in common with the ancient Hebrew justice than with a more civilised conception of it .

The gods then, primarily Zeus, shape the action but they need human agents to execute the punishment and the latter are more or less willing to punish according to the maxim *δράσαντι παθεῖν* (see Peradotto 1969, 253 and Moreau 1985, 264). However, after the punishment which sometimes is excessive (no god told Agamemnon to render Troy into ruins), the avenger will now become the victim because the focus of the action is shifted due to the avenger's overzealous attitude (no god told Clytaemnestra to disrespect them and blaspheme against them

after the deed) ; thus the motif of double motivation is adequately justified. My conclusion is that the gods give the broadlines of the action but men and women will be those who will perform it.

I am not favourably disposed towards those who attempt to inform us on the poet's theology based on the Chorus' and the personages' opinions which are often contradictory but speaking in terms of the evidence offered by the drama, I would say that Agamemnon is an example of the denunciation of the law of raw retribution as least ^{at} it is understood by the personages of the drama. In my opinion there is little doubt that the divine justice in Agamemnon is incomplete but this notion is not static because a new code of justice abolishing the old law of blind retaliation waits us at the end of the trilogy.

PART IV . CLYTAEMNESTRA AND

CASSANDRA

It would not be far-fetched to say that Agamemnon is moving towards the denial of every possible duality which is causally and analogically represented. This duality is reinforced through repetition, working in two ways : repetition of the past in the present and repetition of the present in the future. The notion of timelessness provides the explanation of two significant features of the play : its extraordinary length (West 1990 a,14 attributes it to the numerous "charging" phases) and its extensive use of material other than classical (see Herington 1985, 135 and Havelock 1982, 279). Should one live in Athens and want to write a play about a Mycenaean king and his brutal murder, it is a necessary condition that one should have recourse to material other than contemporary in order to convey an idea of verisimilitude (although not always attainable). By the same token, it is unavoidable to produce a lengthy work since Aeschylus tries to relate the main event of the play (the murder of the King) to other events in the saga of the house of Atreidai (Thyestian banquet, sacrifice of Iphigeneia, Trojan war) .

Although the dramatist makes quite extensive use of material other than tragic, Aeschylus is a poet diligent enough to subordinate his material to the plot and to his aim to reveal a complete reversal of the natural relationships. This reversal is initiated by the characters through the means of tragic conflict (on this notion see Nussbaum 1986, 25 who insists on the morals and commitments of the personages) presented on stage,

in the Chorus' lyrical reflection and /or the actors' provision of background information.

There is no doubt that Aeschylus chose the figure of Clytaemnestra, performing the deed of regicide under the pretence of a joyful welcome, to illustrate the reversal of nature. The task of revealing the nature of the Queen is assigned to another female person, Cassandra, the probable concubine of Agamemnon who suffers because she withheld her favours from Apollo.

I will leave aside for the time being the subject of the explanation for Cassandra's presence with regard to Clytaemnestra and I will focus my attention on the majestic figure of the Queen, who undoubtedly exceeds in tragic dimensions any other figure in the play (with the possible exception of Cassandra). Unfortunately we do not possess the earlier extant versions of this play but if one regards the social position of Homeric women as privileged and if one regards this as reflecting the Bronze Age social practice (see Pomeroy 1975, 33), we can have a historical parallel for the presence of the Queen. If one wants to push the matter further, one should note that there is adequate ground to advance the opinion that there existed in Crete a version according to which Clytaemnestra was the main participant in the crime while Aegisthus had a subordinate role (see Davies 1969, 235). I will not make any other attempt to deny the originality of Aeschylus because I understand that the ground is not very firm but suffice it to say that perhaps the contribution of the poet was the extremely successful manipulation of the motif of regicide and not the motif itself.

I would like also to stress that I will try not to deal with the possibility of extracting information from the play about whether or not Aeschylus attempted to give us a glimpse of the social reality of his time or of women's secret aspirations (Gomme 1925, 8 ff responds negatively while Kitto ²1977, 228 and Seltman 1955, 120 respond positively) for the simple reason that there is a fundamental gap separating tragedy from society but without being extremist, I would like to say that rivalries between wife and husband about concubines are possible to contain a germ of truth.

There is no doubt that the relationship between Clytaemnestra and Cassandra is far from being friendly and of course that is self-explanatory because their stature is totally different but we should not disregard the fact that they are both women and during the play's unfolding we will discover a lot of common traits (Golden 1985, 101 argues that there was an Athenian tendency to emphasize the similarities between subordinate social groupings). However one should be cautious not to overemphasize their similarities and mistake them for something more because I believe that these common traits paradoxically stem from their different function in the play : Clytaemnestra is trying to keep the Elders, the herald, her husband and Cassandra in the dark about her plans while Cassandra is trying to make the Elders realise what the horrible truth is (on the similarity of the opposites see Beck 1975, 98) .

I will try to discover the relationship between the Queen and Cassandra following the flow of the play because I believe that the arrangement of the presentation of the events by Aeschylus is not accidental and so every time we are dealing with

a scene, we should not be oblivious of what preceded it and of what will follow. Although Clytaemnestra will try to converse with Cassandra very briefly (Ag.1035-1068), we have an opportunity to appraise the figure of the Queen, whose revelation is not of course reserved for this scene.

Although the Watchman in the prologue does not refer directly to the Queen, the word *ἀνδρόβουλον* that he uses (Ag.11) is sufficient enough to make a severe impact on the audience, especially if taken in combination with the situation in the house. The nature of the adjective and its juxtaposition to *γυναικός* imply that the figure who is about to dominate the play is not common but she is placed beyond the social norm.

When the Elders enter the orchestra to sing the *parodos*, instead of informing us about the reasons for their presence, they start singing about the events at Aulis, resulting in the sacrifice of Iphigeneia. The Chorus after referring to their age and their consequent absence from the war, apostrophise the Queen inquiring about the sacrifice she was occupied with and imploring her to become their saviour and healer. Whether or not Clytaemnestra is present has been debated. However, it has been lastly proposed (Pool 1983, 101, 105, 111) that the Queen is present, an opinion which is corroborated by the use of four verbs in the second person singular (but see the opposite opinions of Taplin 1972, 90-91 and Mastronarde 1979, 102-103). If we suppose that the Queen is present during Ag. 83-103 and take into account that the words *..παιών τε γενοῦ τῆσδε μερίμνης* addressed by the Chorus to her (Ag.99), echo Agamemnon's words when he enters the orchestra (Ag. 848-850) *ὅττω δὲ καὶ δεῖ φαρμάκων παιωνίων, / ἧτοι κέαντες ἢ τεμόντες εὐφρόνως / πειρασόμεσθα*

πῆμ' ἀποστρέψαι νόσου then we learn a lot about Clytaemnestra. Since the Chorus address her with almost the same words that Agamemnon uses, then it is permissible to say that the Queen here works as a substitute for the King. The whole address brings the Elders in subordinate position because they implicitly admit the superiority of the Queen since no one summoned them but they came by their own free will and are influenced by Clytaemnestra's actions (see Fraenkel 1950, 296). However, the most important element is the prolonged silence of the Queen who allegedly appears, says nothing and disappears ; she must be extremely absorbed by her task and does not take any notice of the Chorus. Another character will appear much later who will be initially reluctant to converse with the Queen, the Trojan captive Cassandra. I think it becomes clear that from the beginning of the play there is a disruption of order: a manipulating woman assuming the position of a man ; small wonder the winds at Aulis are provoked by a similar disruption of order: Artemis disagrees with Zeus. The human and the divine levels are not totally isolated but are characterised by parallel tendencies as Rabinowitz (1981, 169) argues. The subordination of the Elders to Clytaemnestra is markedly apparent at the end of parodos. Leaving aside the controversial subject of the meaning of the verses (Ag. 256-257) θέλει τόδ' ἄγχιστον Ἄ/ πίας γάλας μονόφρουρον ἔρκος (Klinton 1979, 15 thinks that they include a reference to Zeus while Delcourt 1934, 241 traces the subject in the pre-Olympian religion. Vernant 1974, 107 relates the allusion to Zeus Herkeios to the Queen's predominant place) I would like to focus my attention on the second address to the Queen (Ag. 258-263) where the Elders clearly honour her because her husband is

absent, implore her to speak but they say that they would not rebuke her for being reluctant to do so. I do not believe that there is a better indication of the Chorus' subservience to the Queen. Considering this to be a given, perhaps we can say that Ag.256-257 contain an implicit reference to Clytaemnestra through the metonymic function of the language; besides that, the watchman used metonymy to refer to the Queen (Ag. 11).

Clytaemnestra will respond to the Chorus' address first by a brief statement of the news i.e. the sack of Troy and then she will be engaged in a stichomythia with them in order to convince them to believe her message. We should take into consideration that whatever the Queen might say should not necessarily be totally consistent but should be persuasive enough to gain credence. She will employ for this purpose the beacon speech, the origin of which is a controversial subject (for Duke 1953, 326 it is a Spartan custom while Verrall 1889, xx n.1 believes that its origin is Persian. However, Mylonas 1966, 225 was able to discern a look-out on mount Elis and to deduce that the relay of beacons was a part of a long-standing tradition). We should also note that the beacon speech is an answer to the Chorus' question about the bringer of the news of the Troy's fall. Clytaemnestra by starting her account with the name of Hephaistos (Ag.281) ended the game before it had even started: the Elders cannot question the divine authority. From then on, she impresses them by using the familiar technique of catalogues (a debt to Homer see Baldock 1989, 25) and by creating a new "cosmogony" complementing the geographical account (Bérnard 1985,92). The primitive elements of earth, air, fire and water will cooperate to transmit the message from Troy to Argos. In this

case we have a reference to the primitive significance of *λαμπαδηδρομία* which was initially thought to be a magic fertility rite (see Maxwell-Stuart 1973, 451 who traces in Clytaemnestra's words numerous sexual nuances).

On the surface the beacon speech is about the transmission of the signal but the narration takes a deeper meaning, that of the transmission of guilt and the consequent retribution (note the vocabulary related to war and destruction [Ag.286] *νωτίσαι*, [Ag.290-291] *..οὐδ' ἀφρασμόνως ὕπνῳ / νικώμενος..*, [Ag.301] *φρουρά*, [Ag.302, Ag.308] *ἔσκηψεν*, [Ag.310] *σκήπτει*). Gantz (1977, 28) believes that fire symbolises the destructive aspect of vengeance and his opinion is corroborated by the fact that some of the places (*Λήμνον* [Ag. 284], *Κιθαιρώνας* [Ag.298], *Γοργώπιν* [Ag.302]) are associated with ambush and female violence as Raeburn argues (1984, 21). It is noteworthy that the reference to *'Αραχναῖον αἶπος*, the second to last station (Ag.309) is going to be echoed much later when the Chorus bewail the King's death (Ag. 1492= Ag.1516) *κεῖσαι δ' ἀράχνης ἐν ὑφάσματι τῷιδε*. The Queen has now become the spider.

With the beacon speech, the Queen has clearly demonstrated that she is in control of the situation. Since it is impossible for her to know in advance the itinerary of the transmission of the signals (Headlam 1910, 7 rightly insists that the Queen like the watchman, knew of only one beacon that on the mount Arachneus) in this deceiving speech the Queen pretends to know a lot about the geographical space and of the related events (see Bollack and de la Combe 1981, 350, 362). If we want to consider the opinion according to which the Queen makes her entrance through the palace to be valid, then her mastery of the

space contains also that of the dramatic action. As a result, the Elders are baffled after the end of the beacon speech (note the use of *αὖθις* [Ag.317], *κάποθαυμάσαι* [Ag.318], *διηνεκῶς πάλιν* [Ag.319] the last word being superfluous). The Chorus are rightly agitated because of the good news and want to listen again but the Queen will launch a narration of the sack of Troy which is ridden with ominous references, thus displeasing them.

She starts her speech by choosing the present narrative and uttering a blunt statement (Ag. 320) *Τροίαν Ἀχαιοὶ τῇιδ' ἔχουσ' ἐν ἡμέραι*. As she did in the beacon speech through her reference to Hephaistos, this statement speaks volumes about her intention of having the initiative. If the mention of Hephaistos provides the divine authority upon which she built up her beacon speech, this statement forms the base on which the narration of the sack of Troy will be founded. This time she is the authority (if the truth of the statement were arguable, the impact of her speech would be minimised).

The speech of the Queen will fail to live up to the Elders' expectations because it devotes only four lines to the hardships of Trojan people (Ag.325-329) thus "staining" the impression she created with the beacon speech (the Chorus naively believed that it was a good sign). The rest of the speech (Ag. 330-350) is devoted to the fate of Greeks and its tone is not at all joyful.

At the moment when someone would expect a favourable portrayal of them, Clytaemnestra presents an image of undisciplined and exhausted soldiers with the prospect of divine punishment for possible transgressions looming ahead. The Queen wishes that the army will come back unharmed (even though she

uses a conditional clause) by the gods because (Ag. 346) *ἐγρηγορός τὸ πῆμα τῶν ὀλοότων*. Although some editors delete this line, I would prefer to keep it because it contrasts with the meaning of the conditional clause thus providing insight to Clytaemnestra's secret hopes and echoes the statement of the Chorus in the parodos about the Wrath avenging the children (Ag. 154-155) (Kitto 1959, 10 pushes the matter further by identifying the Queen with the Wrath who operates after Artemis' consent but this is in my opinion a bit far-fetched. The connection, if there is one, will take place much later). The speech of the Queen will end in a tone of mocking irony (Ag. 348-349) *τοιαῦτά τοι γυναικὸς ἐξ ἑμοῦ κλύεις. / τὸ δ' εὖ κρατοίη μὴ διχορρόπως ἰδεῖν*. The first verse has an obvious recipient, the Chorus, who disbelieved Clytaemnestra's statement that Troy was sacked. The second is ironic because what is good for the Chorus is not good for the Queen. It is significant that the word *διχορρόπως* occurs in the speech of Agamemnon (Ag. 815) when the King refers to the unanimous decision of the gods to punish Troy.

After the second narration by Clytaemnestra, the Elders seem to be convinced that Troy was sacked but they did not understand anything of Clytaemnestra's double talk. The first line of their reply justifies my opinion (Ag. 351) *γύναι, κατ' ἄνδρα σώφρον' εὐφρόνως λέγεις*. Not only do they think that the Queen spoke wisely but this time corroborate what the watchman said about her manly nature. Although their excitement is markedly diminished (note the absence of emphasis), they are still prepared to invoke the gods.

The patient reader will wonder what had really changed between the Chorus' initial disbelief towards the Queen

and their posterior willingness to believe her. My answer is : practically nothing but the reversal of the situation is attributable to the Queen's persuasive power. Although she did not have any concrete evidence to offer, Aeschylus managed to make her persuade the Chorus by using the following technique : a delayed engagement into speech (although she is present from Ag.83-103 she starts speaking in Ag. 264) and the manipulation of the language in two successive visions. Clytaemnestra could not have been present neither in the transmission of the signals nor during the sack of Troy but as a prophet in the opinion of Hogan (Hogan 1984, 50) she can be in both places and provide accurate information (it is important to note that a psychological change of sex and the power of bilocation characterise the ecstatic prophet see Dodds 1951, 146). Her speech concerning Troy will be grimly confirmed by the herald. In my opinion, the Queen did not only speak about the fall of Troy but enacted the whole episode because her whole speech was overloaded with emotionally charged phrases (see Bollack and de la Combe 1981, v.2, 193) and because the past tense is absent from her speech showing that she does not seem to take very much into account the distinction between past and present (Benveniste 1973, 527 relates this feature to the gift of the second sight). Of course for someone who has not read the play all these features will be considered to be irrelevant but as the play unfolds, the connection between the Queen and the captive who both see double (so Zeitlin 1990, 86) will become all the more clear, especially in the Cassandra scene.

During the biggest part of the first stasimon, there are no references to the Queen but the Chorus influenced by the Queen's second ominous speech sing a song favourable to the

Argives at the beginning but later the tone is totally changed. Although the first part of the stasimon is devoted to Paris' transgressions, we can not help but notice the influence of Clytaemnestra's words in a general tragic reflection (Ag. 381-384) *οὐ γάρ ἐστιν ἑπαλξίς / πλούτου πρὸς κόρον ἀνδρὶ / λακτίσαντι μέγαν Δίκας / βωμὸν εἰς ἀφάνειαν*. If we remember what the Queen said about the possibility of the Argive army's destroying the altars of the gods (Ag. 339), then the applicability of the rhesis is extended. The influence of Clytaemnestra's words can be easily seen in the part devoted to those who fell during the war for the sake of Helen. The Chorus here supply the information omitted by the Queen as the latter spoke only of Trojan casualties. The last part of the stasimon is devoted to an inquiry into the truthfulness of the beacon message. It is striking that the Chorus now express doubts about it, whereas when Clytaemnestra delivered it they were more than eager to accept it. One must definitely wonder about the reasons for this change of heart. A possible explanation could be that since the Queen's second speech and the biggest part of the stasimon were proved to be less than favourable to the Argives it is somehow natural to raise doubts about her first speech as well. As far as dramatic technique is concerned, it is important to note that the Chorus must change opinion in order to make the herald scene dramatically more effective (this is an usual feature of the play see Alexanderson 1969,19). It is noteworthy that the Elders devote few lines to the possibility of the beacon's favourable meaning ; in the remaining part of their song they express doubts about women's (and implicitly the Queen's) sound judgment. The stress they put on this subject makes me think that they do not believe in the favourable

outcome of the beacon speech and perhaps they think that the whole story is a lie. However, in *Ag.* 500 *εὖ γὰρ πρὸς εὖ φανεῖσι προσθήκη πέλοι* they seem not to have doubts about the validity of Clytaemnestra's beacon speech and believe that the herald will corroborate it.

Although the herald had not met the Queen before, his first speech is strangely modelled on Clytaemnestra's previous two speeches and generally on what we know about her until that time. After greeting the gods and the earth, he speaks about the plague Apollo sent because Agamemnon refused to give Chryseis back to her father and priest of Apollo. Besides the reference to the Trojan captive, some of the audience who knew their Homer would recall how derogatorily Agamemnon spoke about his wife when he was embittered against Achilles (see Taplin 1990, 78). Then, the herald implores Apollo to become saviour and healer again (on the connection of this motif with Clytaemnestra and Agamemnon see p.121) and proceeds to say that the whole city should welcome back Agamemnon because (*Ag.* 522) *ἦκει γὰρ ὑμῖν φῶς ἐν εὐφρόνῃ φέρων*. No one will miss the correspondence of this statement with Clytaemnestra's beacon speech; Agamemnon has now become the torch sent by himself to transmit the message of his victory and what the herald later says confirms in the most precise way Clytaemnestra's words in her narration of the last night of Troy. In the second speech, he speaks about the hardships of the Argives at Troy and he concludes (*Ag.* 574) *νικᾷ τὸ κέρδος, πῆμα δ' οὐκ ἀντιρρέπει* which is modelled on Clytaemnestra's expression (*Ag.* 349) and the Chorus for the third time admit his defeat (*Ag.* 583). From a strict point of view these two speeches of the herald were irrelevant because

the fact that he is crowned with olive branches (note the emphatic *κατάσκιον* in [Ag.493]) is an unmistakable witness that he brings good news which can not be other than the fall of Troy.

The herald's presence is a visual and verbal corroboration of the Queen's words. Although she is not present, Aeschylus' familiar technique, the skilful manipulation of the language, is used (the herald carefully om its any ominous references for now, but later he will be forced to say the plain truth). By invoking again Apollo's help, the herald implicitly admits that he has a lot to be anxious about.

The Chorus, baffled at his message ask him to go inside the palace and report the good news but suddenly Clytaemnestra comes out from the central door unannounced and delivers a lengthy speech which on the surface conveys the impression of truthfulness but is deeply untrue and deceiving so she tries to manipulates the Chorus again. She does not miss the opportunity to rebuke them for mocking her and to claim that she has got support for her previous actions from a lot of people (Ag. 595-596).

Then she obviously tries to despatch the herald back to Agamemnon because she does not want the Elders to tell him that the house of Atreus does not fare extremely well. Adittionally, the Queen tries to prevent this danger by uttering a completely false and boastful speech claiming that she is faithul to her husband, like a watchdog protecting his master's house. I think that for the time being it is enough to say that the dog is traditionally an animal standing between nature and culture because it can be both loyal and mischievous as Harriott argues (1982, 17). Moreover as Clytaemnestra is the watchdog of the

house, her association with Cerberus, the watchdog of Hades, might not be very far-fetched especially if someone takes into account the role that Clytaemnestra will play later in the play (see Roisman 1984, 101 who thinks that the motif of the dog is a Homeric loan).

Another proof that the maintenance of the house was in good hands, while the king was away, is the fact that the Queen did not harm the seals which perhaps sealed the storeroom (I would desist from the view of giving to the word *σημαντήριον* [Ag. 609] a sexual meaning because the Queen will speak about her fidelity one line later). If my interpretation is correct, all the above mean that the wealth of the house has remained intact (on the social custom of the women as keepers of the storeroom see Janssens-Kuenen 1941, 206, 214). The motif of the wealth of the house will be of great avail to her after having convinced Agamemnon to enter the palace to meet his death .

After Clytaemnestra's admonition to the herald to transmit the good news to the King, we would expect either his immediate departure or at least his reply but we are deceived in both respects because the Chorus admonish him to speak about Menelaus and he consents to do so. This is the first verbal defeat of the Queen ; she might have conveyed the impression that everything in the house goes well (at least the Chorus seemed to believe her: note their expression *εὐπρεπῆ λόγον* [Ag. 616]) but now she has to leave the scene as she cannot do anything to prevent a further exchange of words between the Chorus and the herald. As will happen later with Cassandra, the Queen is defeated by someone who unconsciously employs her techniques (although the herald does this unskilfully) and belongs on Agamemnon's side.

Now the verbal game is about to be played between the Chorus and the herald.

The latter is initially reluctant to provide information about the whereabouts of Menelaus and tries to avoid an explicit narration with two brief statements (Ag. 624-625, Ag. 632-633) but the Chorus is willing to learn more and consequently the herald is almost forced to launch a lengthy narration about the storm in Thrace preceded by some remarks, the first of which is (Ag. 644-645) *τοιῶνδε μὲν τοι πημάτων σεσαγμένον / πρέπει λέγειν παιῶνα τόνδ' Ἑρινύων*. We can immediately understand that the storm is about to be connected with the intervention of the Erinyes and the herald proceeds (Ag. 648-649) *πῶς κεδνὰ τοῖς κακοῖσι συμμείξω, λέγων / χειμῶν' Ἀχαιοῖς οὐκ ἀμήνιτον θεῶν*; The storm has now become a god-sent punishment and the obvious question is the reason for this (if everything went well at Troy and no transgression was committed, then the punishment would be absurd). The herald does not bother to provide any reason for the storm (I would not consider Cassandra's rape in the temple by Ajax to be one although I cannot discard it altogether) and he starts to inform the Elders about the storm (Ag. 650-651) *ξυνάμοσαν γάρ, ὄντες ἔχθιστοι τὸ πρὶν, / πῦρ καὶ θάλασσα..* Bearing in mind the divine origin of the storm, it is absolutely legitimate to say that fire and water were the instruments of the gods' anger. It is interesting to note that fire and water are used for magical purposes as Rose (1925, 147) argues ; in nature fire and water have contradictory results but here they cooperate to destroy the Argive navy. However, if one can easily explain the presence of water in a storm, how can one account for the presence of fire? If mere guesswork can solve the problem, I think that the mention

of fire has nothing to do with the storm itself but with the fall of Troy (note the junction of fire with *Ἀργείων στρατόν* [Ag.652] which means infantry because there is a special word for the navy *ναυτικῶι στρατῶι* [Ag. 634]). If this interpretation is correct, then we can establish a connection between Clytaemnestra's beacon speech and this statement. The Queen tried to persuade the Chorus that the relay of beacons had a favourable meaning (note that Hephaistos, the manufacturer of the soldiers' arms, authorises the transmission of the signals, the first of which should be the fire from the smoking ruins of Troy). The herald here implicitly and subtly tries to persuade the Chorus for the opposite thus contrasting his message with the favourable meaning of his first two speeches. During the heavy storm, the god's hand (note that the expression *θεός τις* [Ag.663] is used either because the speaker does not know which god is involved or he is afraid to pronounce his name as Dietrich 1965, 299 convincingly argues) touched the helm and saved Agamemnon's ship thus permitting the sailors to arrive after some more hardships at Argos. The herald rounds off his speech with the usual expression that everything may go well echoing the Queen's second ominous speech about Troy's last night.

If we compare the opening with the closing lines of the herald scene, we see that there is a difference in tone. A scene started with the best omens for the Argives and Agamemnon had ended again in an atmosphere of doom and despair, which perhaps justifies why the herald invokes Apollo to be their saviour again and why he finishes his speech by claiming that (Ag. 680) *ποσαῦτ' ἀκούσας ἴσθι τάληθ' κλυών* implying that everything he said prior to his final speech was not entirely true.

The herald's presence is the first serious attempt to oppose the sovereignty of the Queen and to take the initiative away from her but his effort is clumsy ; the time of Cassandra has not come yet (note that although she is physically present from Ag.810-1071, we do not know her name).

After the exit of the herald, the Chorus sing the second stasimon which abounds with ominous references. The subject of this ode is typically Helen but the Chorus taught by the herald launch some significant insinuations. After the famous pun on Helen's name, the Chorus say (Ag. 690-692) *..ἐκ τῶν ἀβροπήνων / προκαλυμμάτων ἔπλευσε* (sc. Helen) / *Ζεφύρου γίγαντος αὔραι*,/ It is not difficult to advance the opinion that the word *προκαλύμματα* is used here to denote an atmosphere of falsehood; moreover I believe that the *Ζεφύρου γίγαντος αὔραι* tells something to those conversant with the Hesiodic cosmogony: Zeus used cunning (*μητις*) to overcome the resistance of Giants of whom one was Zephyros (Détienne 1974, chap 3). This illustration of deceiving appearances and of the use of cunning is provided by the lion cub parable (Fraenkel 1950, 342 has proved its Oriental origin). The lion cub which fawned on its masters when in hunger (Ag. 725-726) (the same action is performed by a dog and the Queen had likened herself to it) brings ruin to the household and later (Ag.735-736) we find out that the lion cub was god-sent and was reared inside the house (Clytaemnestra's origin was not from the side of Atreus but like Helen, she came from another family). Afterwards we are landed again in the world of real life as we learn that Helen was sent by Zeus to destroy Troy using her beauty (on these verses and their possible relation to the Queen see Arnott 1961, 76). Helen's beauty was deceiving, her sister's

cunning and intelligence will be also deceiving. The Chorus then generalise about the perpetuation of guilt and say that Justice prefers poverty to wealth and (Ag. 776-778) *..τὰ χρυσόπαστα δ' ἔδεθλα σὺν πίνωι / χερῶν παλιντρόποις ὄμμασι λιποῦσ' ὅσια προσέμολε, / δύναμιν οὐ σέβουσα πλούτου παράσημον αἶνωι*. I think that there is no doubt that the Elders in a way foretell the King's impious action of trampling on the carpet and the Queen's gloating about the wealth of the house.

The Chorus after the herald scene started to gain some insight in Clytaemnestra's thoughts and, as it will be shown in their welcome speech for Agamemnon, try to warn him of the possible dangers but this time it is the King's turn to be the ignorant or perhaps the half-aware.

As Agamemnon comes in the orchestra, the Chorus warn him of a possible danger (of course they do not know that the Queen is planning his murder), put him on his guard not to mistake appearances for reality and express their approval of him although not without some reservations. They say that (Ag. 795-798) *ὅστις δ' ἀγαθὸς προβατογνώμων, / οὐκ ἔστι λαθεῖν ὄμματα φωτὸς / τὰ δοκοῦντ' εὐφρονος ἐκ διανοίας / ὕδαρεῖ σαίνειν φιλότῃτι*. The use of *σαίνειν* brings of course in mind the similar action of the lion cub and if in that case it contained some reference to the Queen, then we could recognise again here an implicit reference to her.

I will not deal with Agamemnon's lengthy welcome speech but I will directly proceed into examining Clytaemnestra's. It should be noticed that the Queen enters again unannounced and if she enters through the central door, she blocks Agamemnon's way into the palace (on this aspect of stagecraft see Ewans 1982, 11). She has no shame of narrating

what she had been through during his absence and launches again another deceptive speech (the only truth of which is that Orestes was in Phocis) to persuade mainly her husband of her love (the Elders have heard the same story again [Ag. 606-615]). However, her speech is not totally untruthful as it contains some grim references to what will happen later (see Thalmann 1985, 226) because the mention of the net and of Geryon with the three bodies will later be proved to be of particular importance. After the reference to her restless sleep, she likens herself again to a watchdog (Ag. 896) and then she launches a compilation of adjectives and substantives in order to prove her fidelity (quite unreasonably because no one had asked her to do so). As it was noted by Wilamowitz (in Bacon 1961, 40), the Queen's praise echoes an analogous Egyptian hymn. Perhaps it is not accidental that, according to the Eastern practice, a god is summoned in many forms simultaneously. If these opinions are sustained, then it is quite legitimate to say that the Queen indulges in an Oriental practice totally unfitting to the heroic standards. She then pleads with Agamemnon to get off the chariot, tread on the purple carpet and make his way into the palace (Ag. 911-913) *ἐς δῶμ' ἄελπτον ὥς ἂν ἡγήται Δίκη. / τὰ δ' ἄλλα φροντὶς οὐχ ὕπνῳ νικωμένη / θήσει δικαίως ξὺν θεοῖς +εἰμαρμένα+.* There is no doubt that *ἄελπτον* has a grim double meaning because the King has been through many hardships and did not hope to see his house again and because the Queen did not hope that she would have the opportunity to murder him. The same happens with the other two verses since the surface meaning is that the King will find proper welcome inside the house but the deeper meaning is that the King will be murdered. We should also note that *φροντὶς* is *οὐχ ὕπνῳ νικωμένη*

just as the mountain Makistos was (Ag. 290-291) ...οὐδ' ἀφρασμόνως ὕπνῳ / νικώμενος.... As a result the beacon speech is linked again with the return of the king but now in a grimer^η context (the word λαμπτηρουχίας in Ag. 890 is associated with κλαίονσα in a less ambiguous way).

The examination of the figure of the Queen would be incomplete if I did not devote some lines to her remarks after the end of the carpet scene. We should bear in mind from the beginning that the King will trample on delicate carpets woven by Clytaemnestra (on a sexual interpretation of weaving see Redfield 1982, 195) and /or her atendants^τ i.e. without the need of male help and authority. Clytaemnestra begins her remarks with (Ag. 958) ἔστιν θάλασσα -τίς δέ νιν κατασβέσει;-. We will not fail to recall that according to the Herald's words, fire and water conspired to destroy the Argive navy; now the motif of the storm is linked with the wealth of the house, which knows no bounds like the sea and according to the Queen justifies its long-awaited jettisoning (Ag. 963).

She claims that Agamemnon is bringing warmth in the winter which is unwelcome since the leaves form a shade over the house to protect it from the sun. This statement implicitly acknowledges that Agamemnon's presence is having almost the same effect as the Σέλπιος Κύων (Ag. 967) (it is noteworthy that if we write the adjective with lower case letters then it means "destructive" [see L.S.J.⁹, s.v.]). However, when Agamemnon comes back as Zeus makes wine from bitter grapes, then his presence, although he is a τέλειος, brings cold. Fowler argues (1967, 45) that this statement denotes the half-renewed love of the Queen but I believe that the textual evidence does not

support his view; in fact I think that this statement (influenced again by the Eastern practice see Thomson ²1966, 77) contains a grim reference. When the grapes are bitter i.e. when the time ordained by the gods is at hand, the King's return brings cold in the autumn, which is more or less expectable. However, the implicit meaning in my opinion is that the time has come for the King's murder (note that *πικρᾶς* [Ag.970] may contain some allusions to the faults of Agamemnon see Thomson ²1966, 78). The Queen is closing her brief speech by a prayer to Zeus the Accomplisher (note that in two lines [Ag.972-973] the word *τέλειος* is found with two different meanings) to bring her prayer into fulfilment.

Clytaemnestra during the scene with Agamemnon made a demonstration of her sovereignty in every level; she mastered the space, blocking the King's way into the palace, the time, seizing the best opportunity to lure her victim into the palace i.e. after his triumph, and the language as she delivered again deceptive speeches abundant with grim references (Aeschylus' treatment of the scene is highly praised by Taplin 1977 a, 310).

After the carpet scene there cannot be any doubt that the atmosphere has become heavier and more emotionally charged than in any previous part of the play. The Chorus have now become a sort of diviner, as the opening words of the third stasimon show (Ag. 977) *καρδίας τερασκόπου ποτᾶται* (sc. *δεῖμα*) (later we will meet Cassandra who is likened to a bird). They sing of the divination which comes into the fore uninvited (Ag. 979-981) *μαντιπολεῖ δ' ἀκέλευστος ἄμισθος ἀοιδά, / οὐδ' ἀποπτύσαι δίκαν / δυσκρίτων ὀνειράτων*. We can not help but recall the *..θυσίαν/ ἑτέραν*

ἀνομόν τιν' ἄδαιτον (Ag150-151) that Calchas was afraid that Artemis would ask. As for the two other verses we will find almost exact correspondences in the following scene. The sacrifice ordained by Artemis will find its parallel in the dirge of Erinyes (Ag. 990-992) after which the Chorus express their wish that their ominous forebodings will not come true (Ag.998-1000). The quest for too much health and wealth knows no bounds thus creating transgression. If one jettisons the wealth, one can be saved but if one sheds blood there can be no salvation (Ag.1001-1021). The King and the Queen are almost equally guilty the latter for having spread the valuable and almost holy carpets of the house and been prepared to murder her husband and the former for having sacrificed his daughter to wage war for the sake of a wanton woman and consented to trample on the precious garments, although he knew that it was an act of transgression. However, I think that the statement has more application to the King than to the Queen because it refers to (Ag.1018-1020) *τὸ δ' ἐπὶ γᾶν πεσὼν ἄπαξ / θανάσιμον πρόπαρ ἀνδρός / μέλαν αἷμα..* clearly alluding to the sacrifice of Iphigeneia which has been performed in front of the eyes of her father. The Chorus want to reveal more of their thoughts to the audience but are restricted by the god-given lot to the human beings. They seem to have overcome their initial passivity but they still do not dare to speak their minds. One might wonder about their reluctance to speak but the fate from the gods preventing them from doing so is likely to be death (especially if we take into account that Zeus punished Asclepios for wanting to resurrect the dead cf. [Ag. 1022-1024]). Thus the stasimon ends in a gloomy atmosphere and all that we expect now is either the King's death or a scene involving the until then mute

captive who came back with him from Troy. We should take it for granted that the Queen knows of course that the (Ag.955) “ gift of the army” is the daughter of Priam, Cassandra.

The Queen now has another victim to lure in the trap and Aeschylus makes her use his familiar technique, an unannounced entrance and a carefully articulated speech. As she did in the King's case, she tries first to convince Cassandra of her good intentions ([Ag.1036] *ἀμηνίτως*, [Ag.1038] *..δούλων σταθεῖσαν κτησίλου βωμοῦ πέλας*) (note that according to Van-Gennep 1977, 98 sacred virgins and prostitutes had to be subjected to rites of passage before assuming their new positions) but the audience cannot miss the irony. She invites her with exactly the same words as she did with Agamemnon to get off the chariot (the first part of Ag.906 is identical with the first part of Ag.1039) and brings as an example Heracles who was sold as a slave to the Queen of Lydia Omphale. It is important to notice that the hero was sold after a fight between him and Apollo because the former, in a state of madness wanted to sack the temple of Delphoi (see Grimal 1986, s.v. Heracles). This mythical reference announces three themes which will dominate the scene of Cassandra, her state of madness, her fight with Apollo and the exchange of roles. Just as Heracles had become indulgent in Oriental luxury and Omphale took his lion skin (see Grimal 1986, s.v.Omphale), at the end of the scene the barbarian will be proven superior to Greek. Clytaemnestra then promises to be more favourable than it is expected of masters towards Cassandra (Fraenkel 1950, 496 notices that what the Queen proposes is the common practice in antiquity). It is important to say that (Ag 1044) *οἱ δ' οὐποτ' ἐλπίσαντες ἤμηναν καλῶς* is similar to (Ag.911) which was used in

Clytaemnestra's welcome speech for Agamemnon, another proof that the means Aeschylus employs to portray the Queen and Agamemnon remain the same.

However, the Queen's words fall on deaf ears and this is the second time that Clytaemnestra fails to carry out her plan. In the herald scene the matter was skilfully covered up by the Chorus who asked the herald to inform them of the fate of Menelaus so the Queen was not really exposed but here the absence of words make her arrogance and her cunning blatant (on this see Rosenmeyer 1982, 84). Clytaemnestra assumes that the captive may speak a foreign language but she still wants to persuade her by speaking double. The Chorus admonish the captive again to leave the chariot but there is no reply.

Clytaemnestra starts to lose her patience and wants to proceed with her plan of murdering the King thus putting Cassandra's murder into the background and leaving her the initiative to do whatever she wants. A situation of reversal is present here; the woman who had the initiative of the action until now loses ground as she cannot convince Cassandra because the latter does not respond. It is not an exaggeration to say that Clytaemnestra did not even try to persuade Cassandra to enter the palace. She concludes that the captive is mad and abandons all the niceties she was filling us with from the beginning of her verbal contact with her and reveals her true nature: Cassandra's bridle will make her bleed now that she is an easy prey for Clytaemnestra. Her last words before leaving the scene betray her defeat (Ag. 1068) *οὐ μὲν πλέω ῥίψας ἄτιμασθήσομαι*. The use of *ἄτιμασθήσομαι* and its position at the end of the verse are extraordinary for the Queen because she admits that she has been dishonoured which

constitutes a dishonour in itself (on the nature of the dishonour in the Mediterranean peoples see Pitt-Rivers 1965, 28). The Elders rebuked her for giving credence to the beacons but the reality has done justice to her; in this case Cassandra's stance is opposing her and she cannot do anything to change the situation. Cassandra uses no arguments but silence and manages both to make the Queen withdraw from the verbal fight and to be a master of her fate i.e. she will choose the time to enter the palace (on the connection between silence and freedom of action see Taplin 1977 a, 318, Thalmann 1985, 229).

I will not try to explain the silence of Cassandra on psychological grounds (i.e. whether or not it was deliberate) because a case cannot be substantiated from the text. The dishonoured Queen has retired and the Chorus invited the captive for the third time to get off the chariot subduing to nec essity. The same people said that the King has put on the yoke strap of nec essity (Ag. 218) but here the situation is different because perhaps the Elders see that Cassandra is not as blameworthy as Agamemnon ; the rest of the scene will reveal whether or not their judgment is sustained.

It is known that Aeschylus used in the Cassandra scene the third actor whose invention served the purpose of creating scenes without the Chorus' participation (Gredley 1984, 11). However, Aeschylus brought the captive into the orchestra (an important archaism on which see Hammond 1972, 449) in order to perform one of the simplest forms of theatrical action, a conversation between her and the Chorus. From the beginning of the Cassandra scene and without the utterance of a single word from the girl, we understand the dramatist's intention of mixing

old and new elements. I have shown that the captive earned from the Queen the right to do whatever she wants; when she was invited by the Chorus to speak she refused but now she speaks without being bidden to do so. We cannot reach a definite conclusion about the kind of gestures that Cassandra performed during the scene but judging from the number of exclamations and questions I think that it is not far-fetched to argue that excessive gesticulation was a component of her speech uttered in a state of divine madness (on the connection of the "divine fear" and the gestures see de Romilly 1959, 79).

Cassandra launches two identical rhetorical questions (Ag.1087) about the place Apollo brought her (which is a parody of the conventional "etiquette" of the newcomer to address the house before greeting the Chorus see Mastronarde 1979, 21) but the Chorus miss the point as they reply (Ag. 1088-1089) *πρὸς τὴν Ἀτρειδῶν· εἰ σὺ μὴ τόδ' ἐννοεῖς, λέγῳ λέγω σοι, καὶ τὰδ' οὐκ ἔρεῖς ψύθῃ*. The last statement seems extremely unintelligible : why is the deictic here? Has Cassandra discarded something of what the Elders previously said as lies? In my opinion the deictic is used for emphasis. It is important to note that the Chorus used the word *ψύθῃ* twice, in Ag.478 where they expressed doubts saying that the beacons might be a lie and in Ag.999 where they wished all their ominous forebodings to be false. In my opinion, their statement in this verse bears the recognition that something terrible might happen and at the same time denotes their impasse : the only thing that they can be sure about is that this is the house of Atreidai (on the junction between Cassandra's prophetic gift and the Elders' ominous forebodings see Bollack and de la Combe 1981, v2, 313).

The prophetess will then proceed in describing the house and the Elders admit that she is like a keen-scented dog (note that the Queen likened herself to a dog Ag.607) but they say that they do not need prophets. Cassandra then begins to focus her attention on Clytaemnestra's crime but starts in a strange way (Ag.1107-1109) *ὦ τάλαινα, τόδε γὰρ τελεῖς ; / τὸν ὁμοδέμμιον πόσιν / λουτροῖσι φαιδρύνασα - πῶς φράσω τέλος ;* Should we discern some sympathy towards the Queen? (Fraenkel 1950, 486 says only that the meaning of the latter *τάλαινα* is deepened when the former is uttered). I think that it is premature to respond either positively or negatively to the question.

The first part of Cassandra's vision is about to start. It is marked by the absence of the the usual dream symbolism, the characteristic of the god-sent dream according to Dodds (Dodds 1973, 185). The Queen is initially mentioned as (Ag.1116-1117) *ξυναιτία φόνου* and as for the other half responsible we should not search very far: it must be the Strife, the Erinyes (Ag.1119) which will exult over the *θύματος λευσίμου* (Ag.1118) (note that stoning is a common punishment for the death of the King see Denniston-Page 1957, 217). Here I think that Cassandra hints at the motif of double determination for the act of Clytaemnestra.

The prophetess will afterwards give us the first glimpse of proof that she is a real *μάντις* as she will prophesy her own death. In my opinion the subject of whether or not Cassandra has a truly prophetic gift is not very relevant since the Chorus has recognised that she is a true prophetess (Ag.1098-1099, Ag.1113, Ag.1132). If this interpretation is correct, then a considerable part of the scene does not contribute a lot to our

understanding thus being similar in this respect to the Queen's beacon speech, her narration of the last night of Troy and a part of the herald scene (see p. 130). However, the prophecy of her own death is a serious contribution to her portrayal since singing of one's own death is unnatural (see Fraenkel 1950, 617). The prophetess will make extensive use of animal imagery, the presence of which can be justified if we take into account that the transformation of people into animals is a sign of a wider disruption of order (Irving 1990, 62). Cassandra alters ^{rate} her prophetic message about the prospective regicide with the deploring of her own fate while the Chorus say that she is god-possessed and (Ag.1140-1142) *φρενομανής τις εἴ, θεοφόρητος, ἀμ- / φι δ' αὐτὰς θροεῖς / νόμον ἄνομον..* The use of *ἄνομον* echoes the words of Calchas' about the Wrath that is inside the house and demands the sacrifice of Iphigeneia (Ag.151). Consequently the fate of Cassandra is linked to the fate of the house of Atreus.

A connection between Cassandra and a member of the house will take place in (Ag.1150-1151) *πόθεν ἐπισσύτους θεοφόρους {τ'} ἔχεις / ματαίους δύας* which is linguistically connected with the affirmation of Clytaemnestra (Ag. 887-888) *ἔμοιγε μὲν δὴ κλαυμάτων ἐπίσσυτοι / πηγαὶ κατεσβήκασιν..* The wording is similar but the situation is different : there the Queen delivered a deceiving speech, here the Chorus speak about a real situation: a maddened prophetess who keeps on bewailing her fate and later threatens to reveal everything about the curse (Ag. 1178-1179) *καὶ μὴν ὁ χρησμὸς οὐκέτ' ἐκ καλυμμάτων / ἔσται δεδορκὼς νεογάμου νύμφης δίκην..*

There is no doubt that Cassandra's words are modelled on the Chorus' account of the sailing of Helen from Argos (Ag. 691-692) because firstly the word *προκαλυμμάτων* is almost the

same with *καλυμμάτων* and secondly because there is a reference to the newly-wed wife. To the question of the Chorus about the source of Cassandra's prophetic knowledge, the latter refers to Apollo's authority (Ag.1202) just as Clytaemnestra claimed that her beacon speech has been originated by Hephaistos. Since Cassandra was Apollo's prophetess and captive of Agamemnon it is legitimate to say that she belonged to the category of sacred slaves (on the status of whom see Garland 1982, 127) but that does not absolve her from punishment for her mistakes. Cassandra wants to avoid the issue of her relationship with Apollo and her consequent punishment and the Chorus comment on her reluctance (Ag.1205) *ἀβρύνεται γὰρ πᾶς τις εὖ πράσσωσι πλέον* (we cannot fail to make the connection with the King's rebuke for Clytaemnestra's grandiloquent welcome [Ag.919] where the king uses the same verb *ἀβρυνε*). One who is more happy than one should be, gives himself airs which obviates the necessity of his downfall. In Agamemnon's case the verb was connected with barbarian attitudes; in this case the barbarian is the recipient of the Chorus' statement. Cassandra's sin will be later confessed by herself: while prophetess, she has promised her favours to Apollo with the prospect of begetting him children but later she went back on her word thus violating the custom (note the word *νόμῳ* Ag.1207). Since the god could not withdraw his prophetic gift, he cursed her so that her messages did not gain any credence.

Another trance follows immediately (on the connection among possession, trance and sexual congress see Friedl 1975, 80, Kraemer 1979, 79). In it, Cassandra will associate the ancestral curse with the vengeance of the coward lion (Ag.1224) thus announcing the theme which is to be

prominent in the last scene of the play and she will mention again the murder of Agamemnon by the hateful dog (Ag.1228-1230). There is no need to repeat that the Queen has called herself dog and that here Cassandra likens her to a clandestine *ἄτη* (Ag.1230) thus revealing the real meaning behind the Queen's words. To make the meaning of her last statement more apparent, she compiles a list of adjectives and substantives just as the Queen did for Agamemnon (Ag.896-901). While the Queen speaks untruly, using metaphors from everyday life, the captive tells the truth using metaphors taken from the world of beasts, an extremely frequent feature of women who betray their femininity and become all-daring (Ag.1237 *παντότολμος* as Lefkowitz 1986, 36 argues). It is important to note that the same word was used for Agamemnon (Ag.221) when he made up his mind to sacrifice his own daughter. This is not the only connection between the King and Clytaemnestra in this portion of Cassandra's speech since the *ἀμφίσβαινα* (Ag.1233) was a viper who killed her mate in the act of love (see Fowler1967, 38 and for a more "emotionally" charged meaning Burke 1952, 393); Clytaemnestra will not do exactly the same but will murder the King under a joyful pretence.

In the brief stichomythia that follows Cassandra's second trance, the grim reality will be revealed by her: Agamemnon is going to be murdered but the Chorus do not succeed in finding out who the murderer will be; they think that the doer will be a man (perhaps Aegisthus but no clue is given). Their incompetence is more apparent when we recall that it is they who have likened the Queen to a man, but here the revelation of the murderer would be dramatically ineffective and

the poet must show that Cassandra's prophecies are falling on deaf ears because of the divine curse, which manifests itself by inducing another trance, perceived as fire.

Contrary to the Queen's mastery of fire (illusory though it was), the fire in this case is uncontrolled. The prophetess defiles her attire and tramples on it thus assimilating herself to Iphigeneia who being sacrificed was silent and perhaps nude (Ag. 230-237, Ag.239) (on this connection see Moreau 1985, 93). Cassandra is also trying to shift responsibility for her action from her to Apollo (Clytaemnestra will do the same later) and moreover she deplores her being mocked by (Ag. 1272) *φίλων ὑπ' ἐχθρῶν οὐ διχορρόπως, μάτην* which echoes the Queen's closing remarks after her two deceptive speeches (see p.126). The similarity between the two female figures can also be seen at the long juxtaposition of words denoting the names by which Cassandra was mocked by those who disbelieved her prophecies, thus reminding us of the Queen's rebuke against the Elders (Ag.590-597) because they did not believe her beacon speech. The prophetess will finish her third trance by foretelling the advent of Orestes and possibly the matricide (Ag.1280-1284) and by lamenting her city's and her own fate (it is noteworthy that the only two personages who utter *ψευδοπαύκοινα* [like that of Ag.1287 *πράξασαν ὥς ἔπραξε*ν] are Clytaemnestra and Cassandra see Johnstone 1980, 60).

After the end of Cassandra's third trance, the Chorus comment on the situation (Ag.1295-1298) *ὦ πολλά μὲν τάλαινα, πολλά δ' <αὖ> σοφή / γῦναι, μακρὰν ἔτεινας. εἰ δ' ἔτητύμως / μόρον τόν αὐτῆς οἶσθα, πῶς θεηλάτου / βοὸς δίκην πρὸς βωμὸν εὐτόλμως πατεῖς*; There are two elements which lead to a possible connection

between Cassandra and Clytaemnestra . The vocative *τάλαινα* was used by Cassandra for the Queen and the expression *μακρὰν ἔτεινας* was used by Agamemnon (Ag.916) to denote the length of his wife's speech. The second element is the vocative *γύναι* which was used for the Queen twice by the Chorus (Ag.317, Ag.351). The last reference in the Cassandra scene to Clytaemnestra is where Cassandra says that some day the Queen and Aegisthus will die as a retribution for the murders of Cassandra and Agamemnon respectively (it is peculiar that here Clytaemnestra is not referred to as the murderer of Agamemnon).

Despite some similarities on the linguistic level with Clytaemnestra and Helen, I cannot agree with Schein (1982, 15) that Cassandra is like them, i.e. a victim but also a Fury because the textual evidence is not adequate to support this view since unlike them Cassandra's presence does not have any effect in the action. For the audience this scene has importance as far as the motif of the ancestral curse is concerned but the Elders have the opportunity to appraise better the figure of the Queen and thus to strengthen their case against her as Herington (Herington 1984, 142) argues. When the Queen will appear again after the murder they will initially oppose her vehemently, enlightened by what Cassandra told them about the curse and the murder of the King (the account of which by Cassandra and the Queen made the use of the messenger redundant see Taplin 1977 a, 324) .

The death cries of the King are preceded by a short choral song which is not so much concentrated on the past but on the contrary deals with the possibility of Agamemnon's death and with the moral lesson extracted from it (de Romilly 1967, 98). The balance of the play is now swaying towards the

grim future awaiting the King after whose cries, we are presented with twelve statements each of two verses which adequately demonstrate the bewilderment of the Chorus and their disorder over the action that they should undertake. One proposes to tell the people what happened (Ag.1348-1349), others to seize the murderers (Ag.1350-1354, Ag.1357-1358), another accept the King's death with passive behaviour (Ag.1360-1361), another does not say something extremely intelligible (Ag.1366-1367) *ἥ γὰρ τεκμηρίοισιν ἔξ' οἰμωγμάτων / μαντευσόμεσθα τάνδρὸς ὡς ὀλωλός;* (what would be a better proof?), while the last two propose to survey the situation (Ag.1368-1371) (doing what?). In the midst of this confusion, the Queen will make again an unannounced entry and all of us would expect her to deliver another deceitful speech; but this is not entirely the case.

The Queen's opening lines clearly show her intention of mocking the Chorus' intelligence thus implicitly claiming her superiority towards the males (Ag. 1372-1373) *πολλῶν πάροιθεν καιρίως εἰρημένων / τάναντί' εἰπεῖν οὐκ ἐπαισχυνθήσομαι* (notice the similarity with Ag.856- 857 where she used the same words to express her "joy" for the return of the King). She proceeds to claim that she made a lot of effort from a long time ago (she puts emphasis on the lapse of the time before the deed) so that Agamemnon could not escape the net that she cast over him; (it is noteworthy that the word *ἀρκύστατα* [Ag.1375] recalls Cassandra's words in Ag.1116 that the Queen is like a net thus confirming a fraction of the captive's prophecies). The Queen's guile, which was prepared from a long time ago, is a new proof of the Chorus' incompetence to understand the situation. After being implicitly scornful, Clytaemnestra claims that she stood where she

struck the King (a perversion of the rite of *πρόθεσις* of the dead King as O' Daly 1985, 4 argues) and she admits full responsibility for her deeds (Ag. 1380) *οὐτω δ' ἔπραξα, καὶ τὰδ' οὐκ ἀρνήσομαι*. It is important not to forget the tautological meaning of the two clauses doubtless serving emphatic purposes. The Queen will later provide a full account of her dreadful deed rehearsing again with exultant joy all its details (on the difference between this scene and Homeric victory scenes see Goldhill 1991, 24) almost taking pride on her achievement.

She spread a net to lure her victim (perhaps an archaic element see Davies 1969, 251) in such a way that it was impossible to defend himself or to escape ; she struck him twice (we should remember that we heard two death cries in Ag.1343 and Ag.1345) and when he has fallen down she struck a third blow (Ag.1386-1387) *τρίτην ἐπενδίδωμι, τοῦ κατὰ χθονός Διὸς / νεκρῶν σωτήρος εὐκταίαν χάριν* (Ewans 1975, 30 claims that Clytaemnestra operates as an agent of Zeus but he does not seem to take notice of τοῦ κατὰ χθονός which refers unmistakably to the King of the netherworld, Hades). This statement announces a major feature of this scene, the reliance of the two murderers on chthonian forces (Fontenrose 1971, 90).

What we experience here is another parody of the third libation traditionally addressed to Zeus during the sacrifice (Anderson 1929, 143 attempted to relate the three blows with Clytaemnestra's motives but at this stage it is premature to speak about them). Later (Ag.1389-1392) Clytaemnestra will liken Agamemnon's drops of blood to a drop of water irrigating the seed, thus assimilating death to life and sexual congress and

destroying the cosmic order through the reversal of its constituent elements.

At this stage Clytaemnestra touches the highest point of transgression; even assuming the double motivation in the murder no god could have ordered her to murder her husband in so atrocious a way. The Queen's beacon speech, welcome speech, final speech after the carpet scene and her "attempt" for conversation with Cassandra were all deceitful; in this case she alters the meaning of the world but this time openly. There is no better justification for her "male-counselling heart" than the performance of this atrocious deed. In all the earlier parts of the play she was superior to the males in words; now she is also in deeds (on her male drives see Golden 1966, 71) because she both performed the deed and twisted its meaning.

However, we should not be carried away to think that her act was purely "male" because she did not use force to overcome the King's resistance but the typical female weapon, cunning (acknowledged by the Chorus [Ag.1426]) and treated her defeated husband so harshly that she assimilated herself with the barbarians (on the barbarian's treatment of their enemies see Nicolaidis 1986, 241). The Queen's words closing her account of the murder are these (Ag. 1393-1394) *ὡς ὦδ' ἐχόντων, πρέσβος Ἀργείων τόδε, / χαίροιτ' ἄν, εἰ χαίροιτ', ἐγὼ δ' ἐπεύχομαι*. We should note the ironic address to the Elders earlier being rebuked for their less than intelligent behaviour and also the allusion to the words of Cassandra because the verb *ἐπεύχομαι* is used by Cassandra in Ag.1292 when she wishes to die quickly and in Ag.1323 when she pronounces her oath to the Sun to avenge her and her master. From these references we can infer that perhaps

there is a strong resolve on the part of the Queen towards acknowledging responsibility for the crime, which is confirmed in her reply to the Chorus, where she accepts full responsibility for the "right" deed. Thus the Queen closes the first part of her speech which abounds with references to her responsibility (see Conacher 1974, 324). Her explicit account of the murder scene shows not only her obsessive interest in sheer glorying but also her mastery over the words (Goldhill 1984, 35 limits it in the deliberate recognition of the deed but as we will see later her abilities are far more extended and cover the whole scene).

The Elders, not knowing what to make of this situation and of this incredibly cruel woman, think that perhaps she committed the deed under the influence of some food and /or drink and threaten her with exile (Ag.1407 -1411) but Clytaemnestra instead of justifying the regicide in her own terms, tries again to play the game of analogy but this time using as subterfuges Cassandra and perhaps her daughter. Iphigeneia was sacrificed by her father (Ag. 1415-1418) *..ὥσπερ εἰ βροτοῦ μόνον / μήλων φλεόντων εὐπόκοις νομεύμασιν, / ἔθυσεν αὐτοῦ παῖδα, φιλτάτην ἐμολί / ᾠδῶν', ἐπωδὸν Θρηκίων ἀημάτων.* There is no doubt that here the language is emotionally charged since Clytaemnestra is so excited that she speaks about Thracian winds which are of course non-existent as there were only winds in Aulis and winds in Thrace but the latter are not related to the former (but perhaps the wind blowing to Aulis would have come from Thrace) and the Queen mistakenly confuses them. What she has conveniently omitted to say is that the wind still prevented the Argives from sailing to Troy and punishing Paris for his transgression and so there can be no parallelism between the sacrifice of Iphigeneia (which was

divinely ordained in part) and the murder of the King. The Queen responds to the threats of the Chorus with threats of physical violence which make apparent that she has slightly lost control of the situation since it is she who is the answerer and her overall attitude seems slightly defensive. The Elders will rebuke her of using excessive cunning and will proceed to say that the murder has induced madness to her and put forward as evidence her bloodshot eyes (Ag. 1428) *λίπος ἐπ' ὀμμάτων αἵματος εὖ πρόπει*. The prominence of the Queen's bloodshot eyes makes us think of a possible link among the blood spilled from the murder of the King (note that in Ag. 1390 Clytaemnestra said that the blood has reached her), the blood in the eyes of the Queen and perhaps the blood in the eyes of the Erinyes (Eum. 54).

In my opinion there is no need to suppose that Clytaemnestra is mad at least in the sense that Cassandra is. The perhaps mistaken expression *ἐπωδόν Θρηκίων ἀημάτων* is something to be expected from a woman who reveals everything that was on her mind from a long time ago (the case for Clytaemnestra's sanity is pleaded by Anderson 1929, 142). The Chorus proceed in expressing the unavoidable law of retribution which is reminiscent of a part of Cassandra's prophecy (Ag. 1317-1319) but the Queen starts shifting the balance from her to Aegisthus who is kindling the fire of her hearth (Ag. 1435). In order to strengthen her case, she delivers an oath just as Cassandra did before entering the palace. While the latter's oath is addressed to the Sun, the Queen's is addressed to the nether powers of her daughter in the name of whom she massacred her husband, another grim reversal of the nature of the oath. Scholars are in a difficulty to discern whether or not Clytaemnestra's words

concerning Iphigeneia reflect her tenderness towards her daughter or are a mere subterfuge to escape punishment (Whallon 1980, 138 and Rosenmeyer 1982, 236 support the latter opinion but Padel 1983, 16 is in favour of the former). In my opinion these references are carefully selected to divert attention from her and ascribe the deed to impersonal forces ; in Ag.1432-1433 *μὰ τὴν τέλειον τῆς ἐμῆς παιδὸς Δίκην/ Ἄτην Ἑρινύν θ', ᾗσι τόνδ' ἔσφαξ'* ἐγὼ /, the person of Iphigeneia is in the background while the impersonal forces are prominent and the crime is executed in the name of them .

The Queen will also justify her deed with reference to Agamemnon's infidelity. Some lines before, she used the motif of her adulterous relationship with Aegisthus to draw a favourable conclusion for her; now she uses the same motif turning it against her dead husband. Apart from the obvious resentment Clytaemnestra feels for the concubine of her husband, her mention of Cassandra serves the purpose of linking the King's downfall with the sack of Troy and ultimately with the sacrifice of Iphigeneia as Said (1978, 160) argues. She calls the Trojan captive *πιστὴ ξύνευνος* (Ag. 1442) using the adjective with an obviously ironic intention : Cassandra is indeed faithful to Agamemnon as they share the same bed but this time in the netherworld. The word *ἰστοτριβής* (Ag.1443) (see p.114) has provoked arguments among scholars (see Tyrell 1980, Koniaris 1980) about its possible sexual meaning but I do not believe that what is meant here is that Cassandra was a woman of ill-repute although it is certainly a word of a derogatory meaning with double entendre. Judging from the plural *Χρῦσηίδων* (Ag. 1439) and from this reference to Cassandra, I have the impression that

in the face of Cassandra the Queen had punished all the concubines she thought her husband had during his absence. She proceeds to liken Cassandra to a swan, alluding to the bird's last song, which is connected with Apollo and mysticism (see Thompson 1966, 183) and perhaps with Cassandra, Helen and herself (according to the tradition [see Vellacott² 1979, 13] Zeus has visited Leda in the form of a swan thus begetting Clytaemnestra and Helen). I suspect that their common link is their adulterous behaviour. The Queen's implicit reference to Helen through the motif of the swan, prepares the Chorus' rebuke of Helen for being responsible for the death of many people and most of all of Agamemnon but they acknowledge that (Ag. 1460-1461) *ἦτις ἦν τότε' ἐν δόμοις* / *"Epis ἐπιδματος ἀνδρὸς οἰζύς* which I think refers to the Queen's deeds. The two daughters of Tyndareus are coupled together for the second time (the first was in Ag.1453-1454) .

The Chorus are putting the pieces of the puzzle together and this time they have the initiative : the story of Helen and the deed of Clytaemnestra are part of the plan of *"Epis* (according to the author of Cypria, Helen was the daughter of Nemesis and Zeus see Headlam 1910, 219). Clytaemnestra tries to exculpate her sister using up to a certain extent the same words as the Chorus (compare Ag.1455-1457 with Ag.1465-1466). From a stylistic point of view, Clytaemnestra is in the same position as the Chorus was in the Cassandra scene (see Ag.1072-1075 and Ag.1307-1308) but there the Elders pick up Cassandra's cries while here the Queen does the same with the Chorus' words. However, what is the most important is that the Chorus instead of accusing her of her monstrous act, recognise that everything that

happened was the work of the Daemon and of the power of the two sisters (Ag. 1468-1471) *δαῖμον ὅς ἐμπίτνει δώμασι καὶ διφυλίοισι Τανταλίδαισιν, κράτος <τ'> ἰσόψυχον ἐκ γυναικῶν/ καρδιόδηκτον ἔμοι κρατύνεις*· (note the junction of *κράτος* with the women, one more instance when the “manliness” of the Queen is emphasised). The Elders have been manipulated again by the Queen and instead of accusing only her of the deed, declare that she is not the sole responsible for it, being perhaps influenced by Cassandra (cf. Ag. 1116-1117).

The Queen does not miss the opportunity to capitalise on the Chorus' statement ascribing everything to the Daemon, who operates according to the talionic law. The Chorus agree and think that everything that happened was ordained by Zeus (Ag. 1485-1488) *ὡ ἰη, διαὶ Διός / παναιτίου πανεργέτα· / τί γὰρ βροτοῖς ἄνευ Διὸς τελεῖται;/ τί τῶνδ' οὐ θεόκραντόν ἐστιν;* It is noteworthy that the Chorus use here rhetorical questions while in the Cassandra scene they gave surprisingly unintelligible answers to the rhetorical questions of the captive prophetess.

The Elders then bewail the unglorious death of Agamemnon and do not focus their attention on the doer of the deed so Clytaemnestra seizes again the opportunity to change the situation in favour of herself but this time more clearly (Ag. 1499-1504) *μὴ δ' ἐπιλεχθῆις Ἀγαμεμνονίαν εἶναί μ' ἄλοχον/ φανταζόμενος δὲ γυναικὶ νεκροῦ / τοῦδ' ὁ παλαιὸς δριμύς ἀλάστωρ / Ἀτρείως χαλεποῦ θοινατῆρος/ τόνδ' ἀπέτεισεν, τέλοςν νεαρῶς ἐπιθύσας.* Clytaemnestra proposes now the most radical interpretation of the regicide: The Alastor of Atreus has assumed her shape. If we compare these lines with the opening lines of the scene we will perceive a great difference (see Bollack and de la Combe 1981,

cxvii). There Clytaemnestra accepted the responsibility for the deed, whereas here she denies it altogether claiming that the Alastor of Atreus was responsible for it. We should not go far to find out that the invocation to the Alastor is a restoration of an older thought into new prominence. In Homer it is frequent to ascribe the responsibility for words and /or deeds to a divine authority (see Adkins 1960, 95, Dodds 1951,17) but here Clytaemnestra avails herself again of the help of nether forces thus twisting the meaning of the Homeric practice. At the same time she corroborates what Cassandra said about the role of the ancestral curse.

However, the Chorus cannot disregard the responsibility of the Queen and retort that if the Alastor was the only to blame, then the regicide should have been accomplished by someone from the side of Agamemnon's father (we will see that Aegisthus, the son of Agamemnon's brother had helped towards the accomplishment of the murder). The Queen now realises that the Chorus' retort has brought her in a difficult situation and consequently it is time for some concessions (Ag. 1521-1523) οὐ τ' ἀνελεύθερον οἶμαι θάνατον τῷδε γενέσθαι / < δόλιόν τε λαχεῖν μέρος οὐκ ἀδίκως > / οὐδὲ γὰρ οὗτος δολίαν ἄτην οἴκοισιν ἔθηκ' ;. She tries to claim that she gave her husband the opportunity to avoid the murder which means that he could not choose to sacrifice his child (although his choice was limited because of the conditional order of Artemis). Then she claims that Agamemnon did not bring the treacherous Ate in their house (implying that this was done by the curse of Thyestes) but he was murdered because he sacrificed Iphigeneia. If these words are authentic (the text is heavily corrupt), they confirm her theory that the

Daemon of the house was responsible for everything that happened. The Chorus are at a loss to comprehend the situation and they ask about the person who is going to bewail the death of the King. The Queen retorts that herself and Aegisthus will take care of it while Iphigeneia will embrace her father in Hades (it is noteworthy that Clytaemnestra uses the verb *βαλοῦσα* [Ag.1559] which was used to express the pitiable glance of Iphigeneia [Ag. 240 *ἔβαλλ'*] to the executors of the sacrifice). The Queen does not distort the natural order because she tries to convince the Chorus that she and Aegisthus will take proper care of the victim's burial conveying the impression that they are magnanimous towards the defeated enemy (the words she uses to address Cassandra in [Ag.1042-1046] have the same meaning).

All that the Chorus can do is to express once again the rule of Zeus that the doer will suffer, a maxim used by almost all the personages but for their own purposes, the meaning of which is accepted by Clytaemnestra, who tries to prevent the application of the rule to herself by entering in a bargain with the Daemon of Pleisthenides (as Cassandra perhaps did after having seen the statue of Apollo Agyieus and I have reasons to believe that Agamemnon's removal of his shoes and his "order" to treat Cassandra favourably serve the purpose of making him seem less guilty see p.111) who has now become an external force (see Micheline 1980, 155). She promises to endure this situation (Ag. 1571) while the Daemon can harness some other house but this argument is not solid since Clytaemnestra does not tell us why she performed the atrocious deed if it were so hard to endure (and there is little question that she performed it in a state of sanity). Moreover, she promises to keep a small part of the wealth of the

house provided she can drive away the madness that incites the members of the house to kill each other.

The Queen will intervene two more times in the rest of the play. The Chorus (compare [Ag.1614 with Ag.1221 Ag.1616 with Ag.1118]) launched an attack on Aegisthus' boastful attitude and restarted rebuking the Queen calling her (Ag.1645) *χώρας μίασμα καὶ θεῶν ἐγχωρίων* and the Queen intervenes because the Chorus and Aegisthus are about to start a fight.

Although in the biggest part of her intervention she says that there should be no more misery (note *αἰδοῖ<οι> γέροντες* [Ag.1657]) , she implicitly orders the Elders to accept the new order before they are punished and concludes that they were all smitten by the hoof of the Daemon. Some scholars (Post 1951,80, Raeburn 1984, 23) thought that the Queen became a more feminine almost pathetic figure. I believe that it is her plan to pretend that she is overwhelmed by the catastrophe because she will reveal to her interlocutors her real self very soon. The ironic words with which she concludes her first intervention (Ag. 1661) *ὦδ' ἔχει λόγος γυναικός, εἴ τις ἀξιοῖ μαθεῖν* recall the ironies against the Chorus who raised doubts about the beacon speech. Moreover, both verses of her second intervention are in marked contrast with the surface meaning of her first intervention (Ag. 1672-1673) *μὴ προτιμήσης ματαίων τῶνδ' ὑλαγμάτων · <ἐγώ> / καὶ σὺ θήσομεν κρατοῦντε τῶνδε δωμάτων <καλῶς>*. The contrast between *ὑλαγμάτων* and *αἰδοῖ<οι> γέροντες* could not be a more obvious piece of evidence in order to convince us that the nature of the Queen has not changed.

From the above analysis I hope that it has been made sufficiently clear that Clytaemnestra's character is

consistent throughout the play (see the opposite view of Michelini 1980, 155-156 who puts forward a threefold pattern as an explanation of the Queen's behaviour). As far as her motives are concerned we are left in the dark : her references to Iphigeneia do not allow me to consider her death to be the major cause for the regicide; on the other hand, she claims that she dealt with Cassandra perfunctorily and anyway she did not hope that she would kill her husband's concubine thus leaving the third alternative i.e that the Queen is a monstrous female creature primarily motivated by pure blood-lust as the closest to the textual evidence (her antisocial behaviour has been well pointed out by Zeitlin 1978, 150).

In order to bring her character into the fore the author used the figure of Cassandra who is a master of words like the Queen but unlike her, uses her skills not to confuse the Chorus but to enlighten them towards understanding the situation. She does not say a word about Iphigeneia's sacrifice but she insists on the unnatural and monstrous aspect of Clytaemnestra's character whose act of murdering the King is a punishment for his transgressions (by no means identical with those of his wife: see Fontenrose 1971, 74).

The man-counselling heart of the Clytaemnestra is brought into the fore by another female who possessed the "manly" virtue of going to meet her death willingly and with her eyes wide open; the woman who had scorned on every possible occasion the gods was challenged by another woman who violated her promise to beget offspring to the god thus denouncing her femininity and being assimilated in this respect with Clytaemnestra (Arnott 1961, 82 tries to exonerate Cassandra not

with considerable success). Should one ask why all the "sins" of Agamemnon, Clytaemnestra and Cassandra should be punished by death, one should attempt to answer the following question : Who said that both gods and men are merciful? If they were, there would be no tragedy.

CONCLUSION

Everyone having even a vague idea of the plot of Agamemnon will notice that in this first part of the Oresteia, the notion of suffering reaches its highest point. Apart from the murders of Agamemnon and Cassandra, we get more than a glimpse of the sacrifice of Iphigeneia and of Thyestes' involuntary devouring of his offspring through the constant retrospections that Aeschylus is so fond of.

The personages of the drama do not justify their acts by having constant recourse to fixed moral norms but we witness that, unlike the epic heroes, they transcend their fixed social and moral positions as it is apparent in the case of Clytaemnestra (on the difference between the epic and the tragic hero see Kuhn 1942, 60).

As for the reasons for their actions and sufferings, I believe that I have adequately shown that the attempt to trace them in the function of a sole factor, however strong it may be, is not very fruitful. We should direct our efforts towards a different approach which takes into account the necessity, the divine and the human action in order to illustrate the transition from the $\pi\acute{\alpha}\theta\eta$ in Agamemnon to the prevalence of divine justice in Eumenides.

We dealt with some aspects of stagecraft taking into consideration the reactions of the audience when we examined the relationship between Agamemnon and Cassandra and that between Clytaemnestra and Cassandra. I think that it is useful to conclude this study with a few words on the popularity of the play not long after its first theatrical performance in 458 B.C. Although the audience in all probability had warmly

welcomed the play (Webster 1954, 294, 295 gives adequate proof), the two eminent philosophers of the fourth century were not equally pleased. While Aristotle maintains silence on this (though, judging from his standards, the Oresteia is likely to have caused him disappointment), Plato condemns the trilogy because of the long prevalence of injustice which is not counterbalanced by the more pious ending of Eumenides (see Gould 1990, 293). However, we should not be misled into thinking that among all tragedies, Plato disapproves only of this and for only this reason.

The philosopher raised a lot of complaints against the poets and especially the tragedians (well summed in Gould 1964, 78-79) basically on moral grounds because according to him, the tragic playwrights were too eager to please the audience by showing the human $\pi\acute{\alpha}\theta\eta$ as originated from the gods' injustice, thus inducing people to determinism and sometimes atheism. Plato exiled the artists as they were in his era, from his Republic but in the Laws, probably his last dialogue admitted them, provided they write Utopias similar to his and/or modify the existent literature to suit the ideal city's interests and/or participate in committees dealing with the censorship of the works of art (on their tasks see Lodge 1953, 83).

What seems to me to be the weak point of the philosopher's argumentation is the fact that he singled out the divine factor and treated that as exclusively responsible for the sufferings of the heroes and heroines. He omitted to say that the personages in tragedy are partly responsible for their own action or inaction and particularly in Agamemnon the ascription of responsibility to forces other than human (especially in the case of Clytaemnestra) goes hand in hand with the admission of the

personages' own guilt. In Agamemnon's trampling on the precious carpets and Cassandra's deception of Apollo, their contribution to their own doom is explicitly stated.

As for the moral teaching implicitly found in the Oresteia, I believe that people do not -and probably did not - go to the theatre to witness the triumph of justice, which even in the Oresteia is in serious doubt (see Vellacott 1977, 120, 122) but the often disproportionate hardships of a partly blemished hero and/or heroine frequently originated from knowledge or lack of it. For the personages this sudden change entails their doom and stirs the audience's deep humane feelings towards them. The personages sometimes have "noble" motives for the commission of their deeds but they are at the same time superior and inferior in the eyes of the spectators : superior because of their social and intellectual status and inferior because they sometimes err as a result of their ignorance of information that almost all the audience possesses.

BIBLIOGRAPHY (1) PRIMARY SOURCES

Aeschylus: Bollack, J, de la Combe, P, 1981- L' " Agamémnon" d' Eschyle. Tome1. Vol I. Première Partie. Vol II. Seconde Partie. Tome 2. Lille

Conacher, D, 1987- Aeschylus' Oresteia. A Literary commentary. Toronto

Denniston, J, Page, D, 1957- Aeschylus' Agamemnon. Oxford

Fraenkel, E, 1950- Aeschylus' Agamemnon. 3 Vols. Oxford

Headlam, W, 1910- The "Agamemnon" of Aeschylus. (ed. by A, C, Pearson) Cambridge

Hogan, J, 1984- A Commentary on the complete Greek Tragedies. Vol 1 Aeschylus. Chicago.

Lloyd-Jones, H, 1979- Aeschylus' Oresteia. London.

Mazon, P, ² 1935 - Eschyle. Paris

Thomson, G, ² 1966- The Oresteia of Aeschylus. Vol 2. Amsterdam.

Vellacott, P, ² 1979- The Oresteian Trilogy. Harmondsworth.

Verrall, A, 1889- The Agamemnon of Aeschylus. London and New York

Weir-Smyth, H, 1922,1926- Aeschylus, Vol1, Persai, Suppliant Maidens, Seven against Thebes, Prometheus Bound. Vol 2, Agamemnon, Libation-Bearers, Eumenides, Fragments. London and New York

West, M, 1990- Aeschylus Tragoediae. Stuttgart.

Aristodemus: Jacoby, F, 1926- Die Fragmenten der Griechischen Historiker. Zweiter Teil. Berlin.

Aristophanes: Stanford, W, 1963- Aristophanes. The Frogs. London.

Aristotle: Lucas, D, 1968- Aristotle's Poetics. Oxford.

Athenaeus : Gulick, C, 1930, 1932- Athenaeus. The Deipnosophists. Vol IV, Vol V.. London and New York.

Dionysios of Halikarnassos: Cary, E, 1928- The Roman Antiquities of Dionysius of Halikarnassos. Vol I. London and New York.

Euripides: Diggle, J, 1981- Euripides Fabulae. Tomus II .Oxford.

Iamblichus: Des Places, E, 1966- Jamblique. Les Mystères d'Égypte. Paris.

Longinus: L'ébeque, H, ³1965- Longinus Du Sublime. Paris.

Lucian: Harmon, A, 1921, 1967- Lucian. Vol I. London and New York.

Macleod, M, 1967- Lucian. Vol VIII. London and Cambridge Massachussets.

Philodemos: Kemke, I, 1884- Philodemi. De Musica librorum quae exstant. Lipsiae.

Plutarch: Babbitt, F, 1927,1936- Plutarch's Moralia. Vol I, Vol IV. London and New York.

Sextus Empiricus: Bury, R, 1936, 1949- Sextus Empiricus. Vol III. Vol IV. London and New York.

Soranos: Burguière, P, Gourevitch, D, Malinas, Y, 1990- Soranos d' Ephèse. Maladies des femmes, Tome II, Livre II. Paris.

Strabo : Jones, H, 1928,1954- The Geography of Strabo. Vol V.Vol VII London and New York.

BIBLIOGRAPHY (2) : SECONDARY SOURCES

- Adam, J, 1908- The religious teachers of Greece. Edinburgh.
- Adkins, A, 1960-Merit and Responsibility: A study in Greek values. Oxford.
- Alexanderson, B, 1969- Forebodings in the "Agamemnon", Eranos 67, 1-23.
- Alexiou, M, 1974- The ritual lament in Greek tradition. Cambridge.
- Anderson, F, 1929- The character of Clytaemnestra in the Agamemnon of Aeschylus, TAPhA , 60, 136-154.
- Andrewes, A, 1967- The Greeks. London.
- Arnott, P, 1961- An introduction to the Greek Theatre. London.
- Arthur, M, 1984- Early Greece. The origins of the Western attitude towards women in J, Peradotto and J, Sullivan (eds) Women in the Ancient World. The Arethusa Papers, New York, 7-53.
- Bacon, H, 1961- Barbarians in Greek Tragedy. New Haven.
- Baldock, M, 1989- Greek Tragedy. An Introduction. Bristol.
- Baldry, H, 1961- The idea of the unity of mankind, Entretiens, 7, 169-195.
- Baslez, M, 1984- L' Étranger dans la Grèce antique. Paris.
- Beck, R, 1975- Aeschylus : Playwright, Educator. The Hague.
- Belfiore, E, 1983- The Eagles' feast and the Trojan Horse. Corrupted fertility in the "Agamemnon" , Maia , 35, 3-12.
- Bennett, S, 1978- Mind and Madness in Ancient Greece. Ithaca.
- Benz, E, 1969- Ordeal by fire in J, Kitagawa and C, Long (eds) Myths and Symbols. Studies in Honour of Mircea Eliade, Chicago, 241-264.
- Bergren, A, 1983- Language and the Female in Early Greek Thought, Arethusa ,16, 69-95.
- Bérnard, A, 1985- La carte du tragique. Paris.

- Bevan, E, 1928- Sibyls and Seers. A survey of some ancient theories of revelation and inspiration. London.
- Bremmer, J, 1987- What is a Greek Myth? in J, Bremmer (ed): Interpretations of Greek Mythology, London , 1-10
- Brooke, I, 1962- Costume in Greek Classic Drama. London.
- Burke, K, 1952- Form and Persecution in the "Oresteia", The Sewanee Review, 60, 377-396.
- Burkert, W, 1985- Greek religion (Eng. trans.by J Raffan). Oxford.
- 1987- Oriental and Greek Mythology: The meeting of parallels in J, Bremmer (ed) : Interpretations of Greek Mythology, London, 10-30.
- Chadwick, J, 1956- The Greek Dialects and Greek Prehistory, G&R, N.S 3, 38-50.
- 1976- Who were the Dorians ? , P.P. 31, 103-117.
- Chantraine, P, 1953- Réflexions sur les noms des dieux helléniques, A.C., 22, 65-78.
- Chodkowski, R, 1978- Organisation du temps dans l' "Agamémnon" d ' Eschyle, EOS , 66, 5-15.
- Conacher, D, 1974- Interaction between Chorus and Characters in the "Oresteia", AJPh, 95, 323-343.
- Cook, R, 1962- The Dorian invasion, PCPhS, N.S.8, 16-23
- Craik, E, 1980- The Dorian Aegean. London.
- Cunningham, M, 1984- Aeschylus' Agamemnon 231-247, BICS, 31, 9-12.
- Dale, A, ²1968- The Lyric Metres of Greek Drama. Cambridge.
- Davies, M, 1969- Thoughts on the "Oresteia" before Aeschylus, BCH, 93, 214-260.
- Davreux, J, 1942- La Légende de la prophétesse Cassandre. Liège.

Dawe, R, 1963- Inconsistency of plot and character in Aeschylus, PCPhS, 189, 21-62.

Delcourt, M, 1934- Orient et Occident chez Eschyle, Annuaire de l'Institut de la Philologie et d' Histoire Orientales, 1, 233-254.

de Romilly, J, 1959- La crainte et l' angoisse dans le théâtre d' Eschyle. Paris.

1967- L' évocation du passé dans l' Agamémnon d' Eschyle, REG, 80, 93-99.

1968- Time in Greek Tragedy. Ithaca.

Desborough, R, 1964- The last Myceneans and their successors. Oxford.

Détienne, M, 1968- Rémarques sur le char en Grèce in JP Vernant (ed) Problèmes de la guerre en Grèce ancienne. Paris, La Haye, 313-318.

Détienne, M, et Vernant, J.P, 1974- Les ruses d' intelligence. La μῆτις des Grèques. Paris.

Dietrich, B, 1965- Death, Fate and the Gods. London.

1974- The Origins of Greek Religion. Berlin and New York.

Dodds, E, 1940- Maenadism in the "Bacchae", HThR, 33, 155-176.

1944- Bacchae. Oxford.

1951- The Greeks and the Irrational. California.

1960- Morals and Politics in the "Oresteia", PCPhS, 186, 19-32.

1973- The Ancient Concept of Progress and other essays. Oxford.

Dover, K, 1973- Some neglected aspects of Agamemnon's dilemma, JHS , 93, 58-69.

- 1987- Song language in preliterate cultures in Greek and the Greeks. Vol1, Oxford, 9-11.
- Drews, R, 1988- The coming of the Greeks. Indo-European conquests in the Aegean and Near East. Princeton.
- Duke, T, 1953- Murder in the Bath, C.J, 49, 326-330.
- Earp, F, 1950- Studies in Character: Agamemnon, G&R, 19, 49-61.
- Eckels, R, 1937- Greek Wolflore. Philadelphia.
- Eliade, M, 1951- Le chamanisme et les techniques archaïques de l'extase. Paris.
- ²1970- Myths, dreams and Mysteries (Eng. trans. by P Mairet). London.
- 1979- History of religions. Vol I: From the Age of Stone to the mysteries of Eleusis (Eng. trans. by W Trask). London.
- Else, G, 1977- Ritual and Drama in Aischyleian Tragedy, I.C.S, 2, 70-87.
- Ewans, M, 1975- Agamemnon at Aulis : A Study in the "Oresteia", Ramus, 4, 17-32.
- 1982- The Dramatic Structure of Agamemnon, Ramus, 11, 1-15.
- Farnell, L, 1907- The Cult of the Greek States. Vols II, IV Oxford.
- Finley, M, 1970- Early Greece. The Bronze and Archaic Ages. London
- Foley, H, 1984- The conception of Women in Athenian Drama in H, Foley (ed) : Reflections of women in Antiquity, New York, 127-169.
- 1985- Ritual Irony and sacrifice in Euripides. New York.
- Fontenrose, J, 1948- The sorrows of Ino and Procne, TAPhA, 79, 125-168.

1959- Python. A Study of the Delphic Myth and its origins. Berkeley and Los Angeles.

1978- The Delphic Oracle. California.

Fowler, H, 1967- Aeschylus' Imagery, C&M, 28, 1-74.

Friedl, E, 1975- Women and Men. An Anthropologist's View. New York.

Gagarin, M, 1976- Aeschylean Drama. California.

Gantz, T, 1983- The Chorus of Aischylos' "Agamemnon" , HSCPh, 87, 65-86.

Garlan, Y, 1982- Les esclaves en Grèce ancienne. Paris.

Garland, R, 1992- Introducing New Gods. London.

Gernet, L, 1981- The Anthropology of Ancient Greece (Eng. trans. by J, Hamilton and B, Nagy). Baltimore.

Golden, L, 1966- In praise of Prometheus. Chapel Hill.

1985- Pais, child and slave, A.C., 54, 91-104.

Goldhill, S, 1984- Language, sexuality, narrative: The Oresteia. Cambridge.

1991- Violence in Drama, Themes in Drama, 13, 15-35.

1992- Aeschylus. The Oresteia. Cambridge.

Goldman, H, 1910- The "Oresteia" of Aeschylus as illustrated in Greek vase - painting, HSCPh , 21, 111-159.

Gomme, A, 1925- The position of women in Athens in the fifth and fourth centuries B.C , CPh, 20, 1-25.

Goodison, L, 1989- Death, Women and the Sun. Symbolism of regeneration in early Greek religion , BICS, Supplement 53.

Gould, T, 1964- Plato's hostility to Art, Arion, 3, 70-91.

1990- The ancient quarrel between poetry and philosophy. Princeton.

Gredley, B, 1984- Greek Tragedy and the discovery of the actor, Themes in Drama, 6, 1-14.

Greene, W, 1943- Dramatic and Ethical Motives in the "Agamemnon", HSCPh, 54, 25-35.

1944- Moirai: Fate, good and evil in Greek Thought. Cambridge Massachussets .

Griffith, R, 1988- Disrobing in the "Oresteia", C.Q., 38, 552-555.

Grimal, P, 1986- A Dictionary of Classical Mythology (Eng.trans. by A.Maxwell-Hysop). Oxford.

Guthrie, W, 1935- Orpheus and Greek religion. London.

1959- Early Greek Religion in the light of the decipherment of the Linear B, BICS, 6, 35-46.

1977- The Greeks and their Gods. London and New Jersey.

Hall, E, 1989- Inventing the Barbarian. Oxford.

Halliday, W, 1913- Greek Divination : A Study of its methods and principles. London.

Hammond, N, 1965- Personal freedom and its limitations in the "Oresteia", J.H.S., 85, 42-55.

1972- The Conditions of Dramatic Production to the Death of Aeschylus, G.R.B.S., 13, 387-451.

³ 1975- The end of the Mycenaean civilisation and the Dark Age b) The Literary tradition of the migrations in I, Edwards, C, Gadd, N, Hammond and E, Solberger (eds), The Cambridge Ancient History. Vol 2. Part 2, Cambridge, 678-706.

1976- Migrations and Invasions in Greece and adjacent areas. New Jersey.

Harriott, R, 1982 - The Argive Elders, the discerning shepherd and the fawning dog : Misleading communication in "Agamemnon", C.Q. , 76, 9-17.

Harsh, P, 1944- A handbook of Classical Drama. Stanford.

Havelock, E, 1978- The Greek concept of Justice. Cambridge Massachussets.

1982- The Literate Revolution in Greece and its Cultural Consequences. Princeton.

Heirman, L, 1975- Cassandra's Glossolalia, Mnemosyne, 28, 257-267.

Herington, J, 1963- The Influence of Old Comedy on Aeschylus' later trilogies, C.Q., 94, 113-125.

1984- Pindar's Eleventh Pythian Ode and Aeschylus' "Agamemnon" in D, Gerber (ed) : Greek Poetry and Philosophy. California, 137-146.

1985- Poetry in Drama. Early Greek Tragedy and the Greek Poetic Tradition. Berkeley.

1986- Aeschylus. Yale.

Higgins, W, 1976- Wolf-God Apollo in the "Oresteia", PP, 31, 201-206.

Hopper, R, 1976- The Early Greeks. London

Ireland, S, 1974- Stichomythia in Aeschylus: The dramatic role of syntax and connecting particles, Hermes, 102, 509-524.

Irving, F, 1990- Metamorphosis in Greek Myths. Oxford.

Italie, G, 1955- Index Aeschyleus. Leiden

Janssens-Kuenen, L, 1941- Some notes on the competence of the Athenian Women to conduct a transaction, Mnemosyne, 9, 199-214.

Jones, J, 1962- Aristotle and Greek Tragedy. London.

- Jonstone, H, 1980- Pankoinon as a rhetorical figure of Greek Tragedy, Glotta, 88, 49-62.
- Kitto, H, 1956- Form and meaning in Drama. London.
- ²1977- The Greeks. Harmondsworth.
- Klinton, K, 1979- The Hymn to Zeus, "πάθει μάθος" and the end of the Parodos of the "Agamemnon", Traditio, 35, 1-19.
- Knox, B, 1979- Word and Action. Baltimore.
- Koniaris, G, 1980- An obscene word in Aeschylus? (on *ιστοτριβής* Ag. 1443), AJPh, 101, 42-44.
- Kovacs, D, 1987- A god with a maid, C.Ph, 82, 326-334.
- Kraemer, R, 1979- Ecstasy and possession: The attraction of women to the cults of Dionysus, HThR, 72, 55-80.
- Kuhn, H, 1942- The true tragedy, HSCPh, 52, 37-88.
- Kuhns, R, 1962- The House, the City and the Judge. Indianapolis and New York.
- Latte, K, 1940- The coming of the Pythia, HThR, 23, 9-18.
- Lawrence, S, 1976- Artemis in the "Agamemnon", AJPh, 97, 97-110.
- Leahy, D, 1969- The role of Cassandra in the "Oresteia" of Aeschylus, BRL, 52, 144-178.
- 1974- The representation of the Trojan War in Aeschylus' "Agamemnon", AJPh, 95, 1-23.
- Lebeck, A, 1971- The Oresteia. A study in Language and Structure. Cambridge Massachussets.
- Lefkowitz, M, 1981- Heroines and Hysterics. London.
- 1983- Influential Women in A, Cameron and A, Kuhrt (eds): Images of Women in Antiquity, Kent, 49-64.
- 1986- Women in Greek Myth. London.

- Lemmon, E, 1962- Moral Dilemmas, Philosophical Review , 71, 139-158.
- Lesky, A, 1966- Decision and responsibility in the Tragedy of Aeschylus, JHS, 86, 78-85.
- Lévi -Strauss, C, ²1974- Anthropologie Structurale. VolII. Paris.
- Lewis, I, 1978- Ecstatic Religion. An Anthropological study of spirit Possession and Shamanism. Middlesex.
- Liddell, H, Scott, R, Jones, H, (eds) ⁹1939- A Greek-English Lexicon. Oxford.
- Linforth, I, 1941- The Arts of Orpheus. California.
- Lloyd, G, 1966- Polarity and Analogy. Cambridge.
- 1979- Magic, Reason and Experience. Cambridge.
- Lloyd - Jones, H, 1962- The guilt of Agamemnon, CQ, 12, 187-199 now in Greek Epic, Lyric and Tragedy. The Academic Papers of Sir Hugh Lloyd-Jones, Oxford 1990, 283-300.
- Lodge, R, 1953- Plato's theory of Art. London.
- Mackail, J, 1905- Note on Aeschylus' Agamemnon 1060-1, CR, 19, 197.
- Macleod, C, 1983- Politics and the Oresteia in Collected Essays. Oxford, 20-40.
- Mason, P, 1959- Kassandra, JHS, 79, 80-93.
- Mastrorade, D, 1979- Contact and Discontinuity. Some conventions of Speech and Action on the Greek Tragic Scene, Cl. Ant., 21, 1979.
- Maxwell- Stuart, P, 1973- Clytaemnestra's Beacon Speech (Ag. 281-316), P.P , 28, 445-452.
- May, L, 1956- A survey of Glossolalia and Related Phenomena in non- Christian Religions, American Anthropologist, 58, 75-97.

Meridor, R, 1987- Why does Agamemnon yield? Aeschylus' Agamemnon 944-957, CPh, 82, 38-43.

Michelini, A, 1971- *Μακρὸν γὰρ ἐξέτεινας*, Hermes, 102, 524-539.

1980- Characters and character Change in Aeschylus: Klytaimestra and the Furies, Ramus, 9, 153-164.

1984- Aeschylean Stagecraft and the third Actor, Eranos, 82, 135-147.

Moreau, A, 1985- Eschyle. La violence et le chaos. Paris.

Mylonas, G, 1966- Mycenae and the Mycenaean Age. Princeton.

Myres, J, (Sir) 1930- Who were the Greeks?. Berkeley.

1948- The structure of Stichomythia in Attic tragedy, Proc. Brit.Acad, 34, 199-231.

Nicolaides, A, 1986- *Ἑλληνικός - βαρβαρικός*, WS, NS.20, 229-244.

Nilsson, M, 1925- A History of Greek Religion(Eng.trans by F, Fielden). Oxford.

1931-Orphism and kindred movements, HThR, 28, 180-230.

1951- Greek Piety (Eng. trans. by H, Rose). Oxford.

Nock, A, 1972- Word coinage in Greek in Z, Stewart (ed) : Arthurr Darby Nock. Essays on Religion and the Ancient World.Vol II. Oxford, 642-652.

Nussbaum, M, 1986- The Fragility of Goodness. Luck and Ethics in Greek Tragedy and Philosophy. Cambridge.

O' Brien - Moore, A, 1924- Madness in Ancient Literature. Weimar.

O' Daly, G, 1985- Clytaemnestra and the Elders. Dramatic Technique in Aeschylus' "Agamemnon" 1372-1576, Mus.Helv, 42, 1-19.

O' Keefe, D, 1990- Persuasion Theory and Research. California.

- Padel, R, 1983- Women : model for possession by Greek Daemons in A, Cameron and A, Kuhrt (eds) : Images of Women in Antiquity, Kent, 3-20
- Parke, H, and Wormel, D, 1946- The Delphic Oracle. Vol I. Oxford
- Parke, H, 1985- The Oracles of Apollo in Asia Minor. Kent.
- 1988- Sibyls and Sibylline Prophecy in classical Antiquity (ed. by B, Mc Ging). London.
- Parker, R, 1983- Miasma. Oxford.
- Peradotto, J, 1969- Cleidonomancy in the "Oresteia", AJPh, 90, 1-22.
- 1969 a- The omen of Eagles and the $\eta\theta\omicron\varsigma$ of Agamemnon, Phoenix, 23, 237-263.
- Pitt-Rivers, J, 1975- Honour and social Status in J, Peristian (ed), Honour and Shame. The Values of the Mediterranean Society, London, 21-77.
- Poliakoff, M, 1980- The Third Fall in the "Oresteia", AJPh, 101, 251-260.
- Pomeroy, S, 1975- Goddesses, Whores, Wives and Slaves. London.
- Pool, E, 1983- Clytaemnestra's first entrance in Aeschylus "Agamemnon". Analysis of a controversy, Mnemosyne, N.S 36, 71-116.
- Porter, D, 1971- Structural Parallelism in Greek Tragedy: a preliminary study, TAPhA, 102, 464-496.
- Post, L, 1951- From Homer to Menander. California.
- Poulsen, F, 1920- Delphi (Eng.trans. by G, C, Richards). London.
- Rabinowitz, N, 1981- From Force to Persuasion: Aeschylus' "Oresteia" as cosmogonic myth, Ramus, X, 1981, 159-191.
- Raeburn, D, 1984- Greek Tragedy and the Actor today, Themes in Drama, 6, 15-37.

- Redfield, J, 1982- Notes on the Greek Wedding, Arethusa, 15, 181-201.
- Reverdin, O, 1961- Crise spirituelle et évasion, Entretiens, 7, 85-107.
- Rohde, E, ⁸ 1924- Psyche (Eng. trans. by W, Hillis). London.
- Roberts, D, 1984- Apollo and his oracle in the "Oresteia" , Hypomnemata, 78.
- Robbins, E, 1982- Famous Orpheus in J, Walden (ed) Orpheus. The Metamorphoses of a Myth, Toronto, 3-21.
- Roisman, H, 1984- Loyalty in Early Greek Epic and Tragedy, Beiträge zur Klassischen Philologie, 155.
- Rose, H, ⁹ 1925- Primitive Culture in Greece. London.
1946- Theology and Mythology in Aeschylus, HThR, 39, 1-25.
- Rosen, G, 1968- Madness in society. Chicago.
- Rosenmeyer, T, 1955- Gorgias, Aeschylus and Apaté, AJPh, 76, 225-260.
1982- The Art of Aeschylus. California.
- Said, S, 1978- La faute tragique. Paris.
- Schein, S, 1982- The Cassandra scene in Aeschylus' "Agamemnon", G&R, 29, 11-17.
- Scott, W, 1984- Musical Design in Aeschylean Theatre. Hannover and London.
- Segal, C, 1989- Orpheus. The Myth of the poet. Baltimore and London.
- Seltman, C, 1955- The Status of Women in Athens, G&R, 24, 119-124.
- Sider, D, 1978- Stagecraft in the "Oresteia", AJPh, 99, 12-27.

Smethurst, M, 1989- The Artistry of Aeschylus and Zeami.
Princeton.

Smith, M. P, 1980- On the Hymn to Zeus in Aeschylus'
"Agamemnon". Michigan.

Smith, O.L, 1973- Once again the Guilt of Agamemnon, Eranos, 74,
1-11.

Smith, W.S, 1965- So called Possession in Pre-Christian Greece,
TAPhA, 96, 403-427.

Stanford, W, 1983- Greek Tragedy and the Emotions. London.

Taplin, O, 1972- Aeschylean Silences and Silences in Aeschylus,
HSCPh, 76, 57-97.

1977- Did Greek Dramatists write stage instructions?,
PCPhS, 23, 121-132.

1977 a- The Stagecraft of Aeschylus. Oxford.

1990- Agam^{ε.η}non's role in the Iliad in C, Pelling (ed.) :
Characterisation and Individuality in Greek Literature, Oxford, 60-
82.

Thalmann, W, 1985- Speech and Silence in the Oresteia, Phoenix,
39, 95-118 and 221-237.

Thomson, G, 1935- Mystical Allusions in the Oresteia, JHS, 55, 20-
35.

²1946 - Aeschylus and Athens. London.

Thompson D' Arcy, W, 1966- A Glossary of Greek Birds.

Hildesheim

Tierney, M, 1937- The Mysteries and the Oresteia, JHS, 57, 11-21.

Tyrrell, W, 1980- An obscene word in Aeschylus, AJPh, 101, 44-
46.

Van Gennep, A, 1977- The rites of passage (Eng.trans. by M,
Vizedom and G, Laffee). London and Henley.

Van Soesbergen, P, 1981- The coming of the Dorians, Kadmos, 20, 38-51.

Vellacott, P, 1977 - Has good prevailed ? A further study of the Oresteia, HSCPh, 81, 113-122.

Vernant, J.P, 1974- Paroles et signes muets in J.P, Vernant et. al : Divination et rationalité, Paris, 9-25.

Vicaire, P, 1963- Préssentiments, présages et prophéties dans Eschyle, REG, 76, 337-358.

Vickers, B, 1973- Towards Greek Tragedy. London.

Vidal-Naquet, P, 1981- Slavery and the rule of women in tradition, myth and utopia in R, Gordon (ed), Myth, religion and society, Cambridge, 187-200.

Webster, T.B.L, 1954- Fourth Century Tragedy and the Poetics, Hermes, 83, 294-308.

1958- From Mycenae to Homer. London.

Weiler, I, 1968- Greek and non-Greek World in the Archaic period, GRBS, 9, 21-30.

Weir- Smyth, H, 1924- Aeschylean Tragedy. California.

West, M, 1990 a- Studies in Aeschylus. Stuttgart.

Whallon, W, 1980- Problem and spectacle. Studies in the "Oresteia". Heidelberg.

Wilson, P, 1967- Status ambiguity and spirit possession, Man, 2, 366-378.

Young, D, 1974- Aeschylus: The "Oresteia". Oklahoma.

Zeitlin, F, 1965- The motif of ^{the} corrupted sacrifice in Aeschylus' "Oresteia", TAPhA, 96, 463-508.

1966- Postscript to sacrificial imagery in the "Oresteia", TAPhA, 97, 645-653.

1978- The Dynamics of Misogyny : Myth and
Mythmaking in the "Oresteia", Arethusa,11, 149-185.

1990- Playing the Other: Theatre, Theatricality and the
Feminine in Greek drama in F, Zeitlin and J, Winkler (eds):
Nothing to do with Dionysus ? Athenian Drama in its social
context. Princeton, 63-96.

INDEX OF PASSAGES CITED

I AESCHYLUS

1 AGAMEMNON (Ag)

v.11, pp.121, 123; v.25, p. 27; vv. 40-54, p. 100; v. 47, p. 102; v. 59, p. 100; vv. 60-63, p. 100; vv. 66-67, p. 100; vv. 67-68, p. 100; vv. 83-103, pp. 121, 127; v.99, p.121; v. 117, p. 100; vv. 134-138, p.101; v. 146, p. 101; vv. 150-151, pp. 138-139; v.151, p.145; vv. 154-155, pp. 97, 126; v. 177, p.115; vv.180-181, p.102; v.187, p.102; vv.199-204, p.102; v. 208, p.104; vv. 209-210, p.104; v.211, p.104; vv.212-213, p.104; vv.214-217, p.104; v. 218, p. 142; v. 221, pp. 105, 147; v. 223, p.98; vv. 223-227, p. 105; vv. 230-237, p. 148; v. 239, pp. 105, 148; v. 240, p.159; vv. 256- 257 , pp. 122, 123; vv. 258-263, p. 122; v. 264, p. 127;v. 281, p. 123; v.284, p. 124; v. 286, p. 124; v. 290-291, p. 124, 137; v. 298, p. 124; v. 301, p. 124; v. 302 (bis), p. 124; v. 308, p. 124; v. 309, p. 124; v. 310, p. 124; v. 317, pp. 125, 149; v. 318, p. 125; v. 319, p. 125; v. 320, p. 125; vv. 325- 329, p. 125; vv. 330- 350, p. 125; v. 338- 340, p.107; v. 339, p. 128; v. 346, p. 126; v.349 , p. 126; v. 351, p. 126, 149; vv. 361-366, p. 99; vv. 369-372, p. 111; vv. 381- 384, p. 107, 128; v. 408, p. 105; vv. 408-413, p. 33; vv. 450-451, p. 107; vv. 472-474, p. 107; v. 478, p. 143; v. 493, p. 130; v. 500, p. 129; v. 522, p. 129; v. 537, p.108; v. 567, p. 108; v. 574, p. 129; v. 583, p. 129; vv. 590-597, p. 148; vv. 595-596, p. 130; vv. 606- 615; p. 136; v. 607, p. 144; v. 609, p. 131;v. 616, p. 131; vv. 624- 625, p. 132; vv. 632-633, p. 132; v. 634, p. 133; vv. 644-645, p. 132; vv. 648-649, p. 132; vv. 650-651, p. 132; v. 652, p. 133; v. 663, p. 133; v. 680, p. 133; vv. 690-692, p. 134; vv. 691-692, p. 145; vv. 700- 701, p. 99; vv. 700-708, p. 99; vv. 717-718, p. 41; vv. 725-726, p. 134; v.735, p. 108; vv. 735-736, p. 134; vv. 755-

756, p. 109; vv. 758-760; p. 109, vv. 764-765, p. 109; vv. 776-778, p. 135; v. 783, p. 107; vv. 795-798, p. 135; vv. 799-800, p. 109; vv. 807-809, p. 109; vv. 810-1071, p. 134; vv. 810-811, p. 104, v. 815, p. 126; vv. 819-820, p. 109; vv. 830-831, p. 110; vv. 848-850, pp. 121- 122; vv. 856-857, p. 150; vv. 870-1071, p.122; vv. 887-888, p. 145; v. 890, p. 137; vv. 896-901, p. 147; v. 906, p. 140; v. 911, p. 140; v. 911-913, p. 136; v. 916, pp. 85, 149; v. 919, p. 146; v. 940, p. 111; v. 942, p. 111; v. 943, p. 111; v. 951, p. 112; v. 955, p. 11, 140; v. 957, p. 111; v. 958, p. 137; v. 963, p. 137; v. 967, p. 137; v. 970, p. 138; vv. 972-973, p. 138; v. 977, p. 138; vv. 979-981, p. 138; vv. 990-992, p. 139; vv. 998-1000, p. 139; v. 999, p. 143; vv. 1001-1021, p. 139; vv. 1018-1020, p. 139; vv. 1022-1024, p. 139; vv. 1035-1068, p. 121; v. 1036, p. 140; v. 1037, p. 140; v. 1038, p. 140; v. 1039, p. 140; vv. 1042-1046, p. 159; v. 1044, p. 140; v. 1051, p. 79, 138; v. 1057, p. 40; v. 1061, 79 ,82; v. 1062-1063, p. 10; vv. 1064- 1066, p. 14; vv. 1066-1067, p. 106; v. 1068, pp. 113, 141; v. 1072, pp. 8 (bis) , 26, 30; vv. vv. 1072-1073, p. 26;1072-1075, p. 156; vv. 1072-1177, p. 9; vv. vv. 1072-1330, p. 8; v. 1076, pp. 28, 30, 43; v. 1076-1077, p. 26; v. 1080, p. 43; vv. 1080-1081, p. 49; vv. 1081-1082, p. 43; v. 1085, p. 43; vv. 1085-1086, p. 49; vv. 1086-1087, p. 49; v. 1087, p. 143; vv. 1088- 1089, p. 143; vv. 1090-1092, p. 40; v. 1093, p. 40; vv. 1095-1097, p. 98; vv. 1098-1099, p. 58; vv. 1100-1101, p. 44; vv. 1100-1103, p. 28, vv. 1100-1104, p. 98; vv. 1102-1104, p. 44; vv. 1105-1106, p. 98; vv. 1107-1109, p. 33, 144;vv. 1110-1111, p. 44; v. 1113, p. 144;v. 1114, p. 30; vv. 1114-1116, p. 27; v. 1116, p. 150; vv. 1116-1117, p. 144, 157; v. 1118, p. 144, 160; v. 1119, p. 144; v. 1125, p. 25, 40; v. 1126, p. 40; v. 1127, p. 42; v. 1132, p. 144; v. 1136, p. 33; v. 1140, p. 17; vv. 1140-1142, pp., 89, 145; vv.

1142-1145, p. 36; v. 1145, p. 40; v. 1146, p. 33, 36, 43; vv. 1150-1151, p. 145; v. 1156, p. 44; vv. 1156-1157, p. 33; v. 1167, p. 33; v. 1169, p. 33; vv. 1169-1170, p. 44; v. 1172, p. 25, 99, 105; v. 1178, p. 43, 44; vv. 1178-1179, p. 145; vv. 1178-1197, p. 9; v. 1183, p. 43; v. 1187, p. 43; v. 1191, p. 44; vv. 1194-1195 (bis), p. 46; v. 1202, pp. 43, 146; vv. 1202-1214, p. 9; v. 1205, p. 146; v. 1206, pp. 89, 90; v. 1207, pp. 116, 146; v. 1208, p. 49; v. 1209, p. 12; v. 1212, p. 44; v. 1214, p. 27; vv. 1214-1241, p. 9; vv. 1215-1216, p. 12; vv. 1217-1225, p. 97; v. 1218, p. 46; v. 1221, p. 160; vv. 1223-1227, p. 113; v. 1224, pp. 40, 146; v. 1228, p. 40; v. 1228-1230, p. 146; v. 1230, p. 147; v. 1232, p. 40; vv. 1233, pp. 85, 147; v. 1237, p. 147; v. 1246, p. 9; v. 1248, p. 44; v. 1251-1254, p. 46; vv. 1255-1294, p. 9; v. 1256, p. 18, 90; vv. 1256-1257, pp. 28; v. 1257, p. 30, 43; v. 1258, pp. 40, 109; v. 1259, pp. (bis) 40, 108; vv. 1262-1263, p. 113; v. 1272, p. 148; v. 1275, p. 44; v. 1280-1284, p. 148; v. 1287, p. 148; v. 1289 (bis), p. 105; v. 1292, p. 152; v. 1293, p. 114; vv. 1295-1298, p. 148; v. 1296, p. 84; vv. 1297-1298, p. 40; v. 1299, p. 44; vv. 1299-1316, p. 9; vv. 1304-1305, p. 46; v. 1305, p. 34; vv. 1307-1308, p. 156; vv. 1313-1314, p. 114; vv. 1313-1316, p. 34; v. 1316, p. 40; vv. 1317-1319, p. 154; v. 1323, p. 152; v. 1327, p. 34; v. 1330, p. 8; v. 1343, p. 151; v. 1345, p. 151; vv. 1348-1349, p. 150; vv. 1350-1354, p. 150; vv. 1357-1358, p. 150; vv. 1360-1361, p. 150; vv. 1366-1367, p. 150; vv. 1368-1371, p. 150; vv. 1372-1373, p. 150; v. 1375, p. 150; v. 1380, p. 151; v. 1384, p. 114; vv. 1386-1387, p. 151; vv. 1389-1392, p. 151; v. 1390, p. 154; vv. 1393-1394, p. 152; vv. 1407-1411, p. 153; vv. 1415-1418, p. 153; v. 1426, p. 151; v. 1428, p. 154; vv. 1432-1433, p. 155; v. 1435, p. 154; v. 1439, pp. 114, 155; v. 1442, p. 155; v. 1443, pp. 114, 155; v. 1444-1447, p. 85; v.

1446- 1447, p. 114; v. 1447, p. 115; v. 1448, pp. 37; vv. 1453-1454, p. 156; v. 1455, p. 34; vv. 1455-1457, p. 156; vv. 1460-1461, p. 156; vv. 1465-1466, p. 156; vv. 1468-1471, p. 157; v. 1484, p. 37; vv. 1485-1488, p. 157; v. 1492, p. 124; vv. 1499-1504, p. 157; v. 1516, p. 124; vv. 1521-1523, p. 158; v. 1542, p. 105; v. 1559, p. 159; v. 1571, p. 159; v. 1614, p. 160; v. 1616, p. 160; v. 1645, p. 160; v. 1657, p. 160; v. 1661, p. 160; vv. 1672-1673, p. 160;

2 CHOEPHOROI (Ch)

v. 195, p. 37; vv. 201-203, p. 13; vv. 288-290, p. 13; vv. 329-331 , p. 13; v. 396, p. 37; v. 405, p. 26; v. 405-409, p. 29; vv. 429-433, p. 34; v. 462, p. 34; vv. 469-470, p. 35; v. 869 (bis), p. 31; v. 881, p. 27; v. 1009, p. 31; v. 1020, p. 31; v. 1048, p. 26; v. 1051-1052, p. 13;

3 EUMENIDES (Eum)

vv. 17-19, p. 12; v. 54, p. 154; v. 143, p. 27; v. 149, p. 35; vv. 261-263, p. 28; v. 781, p. 37; v. 791, p. 35; v. 811, p. 37; v. 837, p. 37; v. 839, p. 37; v. 842, p. 27; v. 870, p. 37; v. 874, p. 37;

4 PERSAI (Pers)

v. 268, p. 30; v. 274, p. 30; v. 285, p. 38; vv. 550-551, p. 29; v. 568, p. 38; v. 576, p. 38; v. 725, p. 38; v. 731, p. 29; v. 739, p. 38; v. 852, p. 29; vv. 908-909, p. 35; v. 919, p. 30; v. 977, p. 32; v. 1004, p. 36; v. 1005, p. 36; vv. 1031-1032, p. 28; v. 1069, p. 36; vv. 1070-1071, p. 36;

5 PROMETHEUS BOUND (Pr)

v. 99, p. 38; v. 114, p. 26; v. 124, p. 38; v. 566, pp. 26, 27, 31; v. 578-581 (bis), p. 31; v. 598, p. 31; v. 602, p. 31; v. 694, p. 35; v. 742, p. 31; v. 975-977, p.16;

6 SUPPLICES (Supp.)

v. 142, p. 32; v. 152, p. 32; v. 163, p. 26; vv. 561-564, p. 16; v. 776, p. 35;

7 SEPTEM CONTRA THEBAS (Th)

vv. 136-137, p. 38; v. 150, p. 31; v. 321-328, p. 32; v. 338, p. 32; vv. 343-344, p. 14; vv. 483-485, p. 15; vv. 497-498, p. 12; v. 597, p. 38; vv. 778-782, p. 15; v. 845, p. 36; v. 933, p. 15; vv. 933-936, p. 15; v. 951, p. 36; vv. 965-967, pp. 15-16; v. 1054, p. 38;

8 FRAGMENTS

Fr. 121, p. 17

II ARISTODEMUS

Fr. 104, 8, 1 p. 17;

III ARISTOPHANES (Ar)

RANAE (Ran)

vv. 911-926, p. 82; v. 1021, p. 36;

IV ARISTOTLE (Arist)

POETICS (Poet)

1450 b. 12, p. 115; 1451 b. 7, 8, p. 115; 1455 b.1, p. 115;

V ATHENAEUS (Ath)

DEIPNOSOPHISTAI (Deipn)

3. 119, p. 19; 5. 83, p. 19; 5. 259, p. 19; 10. 488 e, p. 18;

VI DIONYSIOS OF HALIKARNASSOS (DH)

ROMAN ANTIQUITIES (Antiquitates Romanae)

2. 19. 2, p. 23;

VII EURIPIDES (Eur)

TROADES (Tro)

v. 169, p. 58; vv. 306-307, p. 58; vv. 349-408, p. 58;

VIII IAMBLICHUS (Iamb)

DE MYSTERIIS (Myst)

3 .4. 5 ff, p. 17; 3. 4. 13 ff, p. 18; 3. 7. 4 ff, p. 18;

IX LONGINUS (Long)

DE SUBLIME (Subl)

13. 2, p. 18;

X LUCIAN (Luc)

ASINUS (Asin)

13. 2, p. 19;

PHILOPSEUDEIS (Phil)

38, p. 19;

XI PHILODEMUS (Phld)

DE MUSICA (Mus)

Fr. 18. B, p. 22;

Fr. 19, vv. 12, 13, p. 22;

XII PLUTARCH (Plut)

MORALIA (Mor)

2. 45. 15, p. 21; 2. 54. 10 d, p. 21; 2. 278 c, p. 22;

XIII SEXTUS EMPIRICUS (Se)

ΠΡΟΣ ΦΥΣΙΚΟΥΣ 1 (Ph I)

1. 9. 32, p. 20;

ΠΥΡΡΩΝΕΙΟΙ ΥΠΟΤΥΠΩΣΕΙΣ (P)

1. 101, p. 20;

XIV SORANUS (Sor)

MALADIES DES FEMMES (Gynaeciorum)

19. 92-96, p. 20;

XV STRABO (Str)

GEOGRAPHY

12. 3. 32, p. 23; 12. 12. 3, p. 23; 16. 2. 36, p. 23;